Volume XX] *October, 1914* [*Number 1*

The

American Historical Review

THE ORIGIN OF THE FEUDAL LAND TENURE IN JAPAN

IT is quite beyond the range of possibility, in an attempt to prove a certain sequence of social conditions and results, to try on a nation a series of experiments on a large scale which would require for their maturity circumstances of great and changing complexity, extending over centuries. It must then be a matter of uncommon interest to the student of the history of human society to observe that Western Europe and Japan,[1] with no mutual relation between them, independently evolved in the course of a long time those peculiarly definite and exhaustive social adjustments that are known as feudal, under conditions and upon principles which were, if significant in their minor differences, also striking in their extraordinary similarity in the main features. Human history, which so usually eludes a comparative study of its great divisions, becomes, under such circumstances, nearly comparable, and should therefore afford invaluable data to the scientific student of social evolution.

The interest of the theme is enhanced, in the case of Japan, by the fact that she possesses a body of original sources sufficiently large to invite a careful investigation, and larger than may be offered by some of the other non-European nations that are said also to have known feudalism in their history.

Following is a summary statement of some of the conclusions and problems[2] of a study of the origin of the Japanese feudal land tenure on its purely institutional side. For it is thought that an analytical view of the institutional aspects of a great social devel-

1 "Die beiden grossartigsten Beispiele des entfalteten Feudalstaates, Westeuropa und Japan." F. Oppenheimer, *Der Staat*, p. 108.

2 A full discussion of the subject and of the sources for its study will be presented later in a monograph, to which the present paper may serve tentatively as an introduction.

opment might well precede any economic or sociological interpretation of it.

I.

The political society of Japan before the seventh century was composed largely of patriarchal units (*uji*) and of groups of people (*be, tomo*) formed after the pattern of these units. Each unit had its chief, who exercised control over its members and the people of the groups attached to the unit, as well as over the land on which they subsisted. The emperor was in theory the head of the entire ruling tribe, but in reality his power rested chiefly on the members of his own unit and the people of the groups he had specially created, and on the land in possession of the unit and the groups (*mita, miyake*). He was hardly more than the largest among the patriarchs. One of the latter was rising in power so fast that it seemed almost to rival the imperial authority, while throughout the realm the inevitable tendency toward decentralization appeared increasingly alarming. It was the inherent dangers of this system, added to the threatened peril of an invasion from China, that necessitated the great Reform of the seventh century.[3]

The Reform was an adaptation of a system of state socialism that had been elaborated in China. It established a broad division of the free people into the governing and the supporting classes. The governing class consisted of a new civil nobility of rank[4] and office,[5] the higher ranks and offices being accompanied with definite grants of rice-land to be held during their tenure, and every holder of rank and many a civil servant being exempt from the payment of tributes and forced labor.[6] The supporting or taxable class constituted the bulk of the free citizens;[7] it was provided with

[3] Preliminary measures of reform may be traced back to earlier years, but a radical and thorough reorganization of the state-system was begun in 645. After much experimentation, the institutional foundation of the reformed state was nearly completed when the Code of 701 was promulgated.

[4] The system of ranks was instituted in 603, and was revised five times before 701. The final system of 701, which continued till 1869, contained nine chief ranks with thirty subdivisions.

[5] Early in the eighth century, there were provided, exclusive of military offices, civil posts for more than 8300 officials in the capital and more than 3500 in the provinces.

[6] The taxes were of three main classes: the rice tax (*so*), the tributes of local products (*chō*), and the forced labor or its equivalent payable in kind (*yō*). The new nobility was immune from the last two, which were by far the more onerous forms of taxation, but, theoretically, not from the rice tax. Some will probably maintain that at least the office-land (*shiki-den*) was exempt also from the rice-tax, but it may be demonstrated that such was not the intention of the law, excepting the office-land assigned to the provincial governor (*ku-ge-den*).

[7] The population of this period has been estimated as four or five millions, and at the beginning of the feudal régime in 1186 as seven millions or more.

equal allotments of rice-land subject to a periodical redistribution. The citizen owed to the state taxes and military duties.

This is a schematic view of the social reorganization that was really devised and put into operation. On closer examination, the system will be found to have contained elements which would be certain in the course of time to defeat its own ends. Nor did the system comprehend all the land and all the people that existed.

First, as regards the people. The new nobility was indeed conceived on a new basis, but its personnel was essentially the same as that of the old patriarchal nobility.[8] It may be presumed that the new nobility could not so readily have outlived the old habit of coveting private possession of land and men, and of regarding affairs of state much in the light of private concerns. The new taxable population was also in all probability composed mostly of the old free people of the pre-Reform period and their descendants.[9] It is true that the old units and groups as such were no longer recognized by law, and all the free men and women were placed under the direct control of the state; but this must have meant merely that the free were no longer permitted to possess and to exercise public rights over one another. Beyond this, the new system was not intended to do away with class distinctions among the free; nor did it abolish the unfree, who in fact are found after the Reform in considerable numbers and in conditions of great diversity among themselves. The unfree received small allotments of rice-land, but returned no tributes; the private menials were hardly under the direct rule of the state.

Next, as regards land. There is evidence to show that the law of equal allotment of land was in reality largely enforced, though at different times in different parts of the country. But the allotting need not be taken in every case in the sense of an actual carving out of rice-land, which from the very nature of the land of this description was impracticable.[10] The allotment was presumably,

8 An imperial rescript of 646, addressing itself to members of the old nobility, said: "Now the manner of securing your service is to abolish the old offices, to establish new offices, and to mark grades of ranks, so as to appoint you with offices and ranks." *Nihongi*, XXV., in *Koku-shi tai-kei*, I. 443.

9 More precisely, the taxable class consisted of most of the old clan (*uji*) members, some old group (*tomo*) people, and those of the old nobility whom fortune had reduced to the common rank.

10 For three important reasons, among others. First, rice-land (*ta*) was terraced in different levels for the purpose of irrigation, and could not always be easily parcelled. Secondly, much labor had to be invested in this class of land, in its first cultivation, its continual irrigation, and in the careful culture and harvesting of rice. Thirdly, the rigid delimitation of rice-fields, in addition to the heavy expenditure of labor required in their use, forced their cultivation to be

in many instances, a flexible adjustment of tracts in the official register.[11] Much the same thing may be said of the periodical redistribution.[12] It was also fatal to the system that the authorities permitted the holder of the allotment to transfer its title by sale or mortgage Before the eighth century was over, the allotment-land was neither equal nor re-allotted; it had become an unequal, private possession of people. Even allotting among the new population was all but discontinued by the end of the ninth century.

A question of the utmost importance is, what was the allotment-land (*ku-bun den*)? It was rice-land, and did not include the other kinds of tilled land[13] nor the vast tracts of arable and non-arable[14] land that then existed. Moreover, the allotment-land probably was the rice-land that was, at the time of the Reform, not only in cultivation, but also properly registered; there must have existed much rice-land which was cultivated but which escaped registration. It was evident that a system of state organization built upon an equal division of so limited areas of land would soon be upset by developments that must inevitably occur in the remainder of the territory.[15] If to this consideration are added other sources of evils latent in the large fiscal immunity of the noble and the unfree, as well as in the insatiable aggrandizement of the Buddhist Church, it is not strange that the life of the reformed state should

intensive. These conditions must have tended early in history to make the rice-land an object of exclusive private possession (whether of the individual or of the family) resisting arbitrary division and redistribution.

[11] "Rice-land for each member is not considered in detail; a grant is made [in totality] to the house-head in accordance with the number of persons in his house." *Ryō no shū-ge*, commentary on the Code of 701 compiled in the latter half of the ninth century (1912–1913), I. 392–394.

[12] *Cf. Ryō no gi-ge*, official commentary on the Code compiled in 833 (1900), p. 102. Only once, in 729, it was decided that an actual complete redistribution be made (*Shoku Ni-hon gi*, X., in *Kohu-shi tai-kei*, II. 170), but it is unknown whether this was accomplished.

[13] The homestead (*taku-chi*), including the adjoining vegetable-land, was, as might be expected, in permanent private possession and alienable, and was also untaxable, as was the land for mulberry and lacquer trees (*en-chi*). Some dry grain-land (*hatake*) was rented to people, and its extension was apparently unrestricted.

[14] Meadows and woodlands were, in law, not for private appropriation.

[15] Arable land was still extensive, especially in north Japan and in Kyūshū, and its opening either as wet rice-land (*kona-da*) or dry grain-land (*hatake*) was inevitable; the new fields thus created would, even if nothing else happened, more and more eclipse the relative importance of the allotment-land in the economic life of the people. Moreover, the prevailing system of agriculture in Japan at this time was evidently that of scattered farms (*Einzelhof*) based upon individual ownership, not in an over-developed form of the system, but rather in its earlier stages. It was futile to try successfully to supersede the system with another of a foreign origin adopted for the convenience of the authorities.

have been so brief as it was.[16] Out of its failure was evolved a feudal system.

The gradual evolution of the feudal tenure which immediately followed the Reform may be analyzed in two sections: first, the origin and growth of private landed estates, called *shō*; secondly, the rise of the warrior classes, and their gradual control of the *shō*.

II.

The *shō* was largely an illegal growth. When it made its appearance in the eighth century, the *shō* was seen to possess these three characteristics: it contained, as its chief original element, a recently cultivated area of rice-field; was under private possession and private management;[17] and enjoyed or claimed a degree of fiscal immunity. This species of land was destined in three or four centuries to absorb the greater part of the taxable land and people of Japan, while making itself almost wholly immune, and to arrogate to itself some of the sovereign functions of the state. It was the *shō*, therefore, that overthrew the Japanese state-system reconstructed in the seventh century. What was the origin of the *shō*?

It is evident that the cultivation of new soil formed an essential factor in the derivation of the *shō*. Impelled by the need of satisfying the growing luxury of the court and its devotion to the material welfare of the Buddhist Church, and, above all, by the rapid increase of population in central Japan in relation to the production of agricultural wealth, the government, especially in the first half of the eighth century, took bold, if not always wise, measures to extend cultivation. These measures comprised both the tilling of new land as an official enterprise—that is, under the supervision and at the expense of the government—and the encouragement of private cultivation.

The undertaking by the government seemed naturally to have yielded the best results in sparsely populated north Japan[18] and

[16] The review that has here been given of the Reform of 645–701, though necessarily very brief, contains much that will supplement as well as modify the ideas published in 1903 in my *Early Institutional Life of Japan*. The whole subject is full of debatable points.

[17] The word *shō* (Chinese, *chuang*) meant a rural house, or house attached to a rural estate. Its derived meaning, the estate, rather than the house, later became the chief meaning of the term. It will be observed that in either sense private enjoyment of property is implied.

[18] There is a highly interesting document of 722 recommending the cultivation of one million *chō* of land, or nearly two million acres. This is not a place to prove by other evidence that the scheme was intended chiefly for north Japan, and that it was really carried out in part.

Kyūshū,[19] where arable land was abundant and the settlement of people from other regions was needed and encouraged. The newly tilled land was added to other unallotted land as "public land" (*kō-den*) or "surplus land" (*zhō-den*), and held in reserve for future allotment and other public uses; it was usually rented to the people, in order to insure its maintenance and to derive a revenue from it.

Before the eighth century was half over, however, their religious zeal betrayed the authorities into a dangerous policy relative to this class of land. While, on the one hand, forbidding the private transfer of land to Buddhist temples, the government, on the other hand, gave them extensive pieces of land, both out of the reserved tilled areas and from still uncultivated tracts; soon the government even forgot its earlier intention, and encouraged donations of land to temples by private citizens. And the "temple-land" (*zhi-den*), officially recognized as such, was untaxable. Conditions were, therefore, ripe for its further expansion by purchase, mortgage, gift, or nominal conveyance. It is mostly in connection with Buddhist institutions that we see the mention of *shō* in the eighth century.

The next century witnessed, not only further large grants to Buddhist temples, but also the reservation and partial cultivation of extensive tracts set apart for free disposal by the emperor[20] (*choku-shi den*, imperial lands). It is probable that a large part of the areas officially cultivated in the preceding century as "surplus land" was henceforth incorporated in the "imperial land".[21] The creation of the latter was accompanied by grants of these tracts and other cultivated and uncultivated land by the emperor to members of his house and other high personages (*shi-den*, granted land). The "imperial land" was immune from taxes, as was also the "granted land", like the "temple-land". In a short time an abuse which might have been anticipated became so frequent as to call forth an edict, in 902, to prevent its repetition; namely, arbitrarily to claim immunity of privately cultivated pieces of land by insisting either that they were originally imperial or that they had been given by subjects to imperial persons. The prohibition was not efficient, and its meagre effects were more than neutralized from the latter part of the next century, when a peculiar bicameral government, which

[19] In 823 there were 10,000 *chō*, or about 20,000 acres, of "surplus land" in Kyūshū.

[20] Between 828 and 844 alone, more than 7200 *chō* seem to have been reserved as "imperial lands".

[21] The exact meaning, however, of the sweeping decree of 885 declaring all the wet and upland tilled and arable areas as "imperial lands" is not clear. *Rui-zhū koku-shi* (1816), chap. 159, leaf 20.

then began its régime, encouraged, with a view to adding to the imperial revenues, the commendation of private lands to the ex-emperors as "imperial land". By that time, many great private estates of land had already grown up from another source.

This other source was the land newly cultivated (*kon-den*, cultivated land) by private persons independently of the imperial house, as well as meadows and woodlands around the cultivated areas as nuclei. Japan being at this time in that economic stage in which money was poorly circulated and land was the chief form of wealth, the disposition of arable land liable to be turned to cultivation should have been a matter of the greatest moment for the government to consider. According to the scheme of the Reform, all uncultivated land was to be under the direct control of the state, and the benefit of its cultivation was, in principle, to accrue to the people at large. In practice, however, when the need of extending cultivation was felt, the authorities met the problem with a vague and vacillating policy. They were forced to discover after costly experiments that restrictions tended to discourage new cultivation, while its encouragement produced inequalities and hardships among the people. Finally, already before the middle of the eighth century, it was decreed that the cultivator should have the ownership of the land he opened to cultivation, while its area should be limited in accordance with his rank. The intent of the law was that its benefit should be enjoyed by the common people, rather than by local magnates, court nobles, and Buddhist institutions. But it is needless to say that this end could hardly be gained; that the law not only failed to check the wholesale appropriation of new land by powerful men that had begun as soon as the Reform government was established, but also assured the steady progress of occupation. The government never succeeded in finding an effective policy regarding this difficult but all-important question; all it could do after the ninth century was to promulgate impotent decrees condemning the aggrandizement of great holders of land.

It would seem essential, in the study of the origin of the *shō*, clearly to distinguish the two sources that have been discussed. Immune *shō* were originally granted by the emperor, and were therefore as such legitimate; while the *shō* of private origin were born largely in defiance of the law, and, even when some of them received a grudging sanction of the government as lawful possessions, were not in all cases immune. The "granted lands" were standing models of immune estates, but they were, though many and large, not indefinitely expansive. Privately "cultivated lands"

could, on the contrary, be multiplied more readily and were in fact transferred more freely. The former were a cause of the *shō* as tax-free lands, but the latter were, it may be held, direct origins of most of the *shō* whether immune or not. It is seen that, although the *shō* appears from the early eighth century, it was not for at least four centuries thereafter necessarily immune from all taxation.[22] In fact, the study of the process of how the private *shō*, originating as I think directly from the newly cultivated land, came gradually to be assimilated by the immune tenure of the "granted land" and finally to absorb the latter and nearly all the other species of land[23] in the ever expanding scope of the term, constitutes one of the most interesting problems of the period.

III.

During the ninth century, if many a *shō* was still partially taxable, the commendation of person or of land to the *shō* by a peasant was also still largely incipient in form and condemned as illegal. In the next century and a half, however, a great progress was noticeable, both in the commendation of land, and in the rise of immune *shō*; the simultaneous advance of these two was natural, for immunity and commendation would stimulate each other. We now turn, therefore, to some of the causes of the progress of the *shō*. I venture to suggest that this was due, in its institutional aspects, to the parallel extension that took place, of the grant of fiscal immunity, on the one hand, and, on the other, of the private transfer of real rights pertaining to land. Here, again, one was official and legitimate, and the other was private and beyond the cognizance of law. Although their progress was mutually dependent, it is possible to treat them separately up to a certain point.

First, as to the extension of the grant of fiscal immunity. From the tenth century one may observe an increasing prevalence, among

[22] It has been suggested that the immunity of the *shō* of private origin may have been claimed on the pretext that it was an extension of a "house-land" (*taku-chi*), "*shō*" originally signifying a rural house, or of the land immediately adjoining the house (*en-chi*, garden-land), as these classes of land were legally private and immune. This may suggest why the word *en* was often used separately or in conjunction with *shō*, in speaking of the *shō* as an estate, but it fails to explain its immunity, for the institution was not in its early centuries invariably immune.

[23] In a list of the *shō* in the province of Yamato belonging to a temple which probably dates from the early twelfth century, each *shō* is divided into "untaxable" and "public" tracts, and in the former are included original "rank-lands" and "office-lands". *Tō-dai shi yō-roku*, VI. This is an instance among many that show that these species of land had become assimilated into *shō*, and also that *shō* often comprised taxable areas.

the holders of *shō*, of resort to a legal custom which had already begun but had not been firmly established;[24] namely, to invoke charters[25] from the central and provincial authorities which in explicit terms recognized the estates as *shō*, defined their boundaries and extents, and exempted them from various taxes.[26] An important consideration about the charters was that they usually stated that, as before, the estates should be immune from some or all taxes, and that provincial officials should not invade them. A still more important point is, however, that it was discovered at the examinations held after 1069, that many *shō*, as might have been expected, had no accompanying charters,[27] that is, were not legally tax-free. I think it may be shown, perhaps conclusively, that a charter was not first issued for a *shō* as such, but for an "imperial land" granted to a Buddhist temple or to a noble personage, which, because of the increasing laxity of the provincial administration after the ninth century, needed to be protected against the visitation of the local official.[28] From this modest beginning, as the number and prestige of the *shō* increased, many of them that were controlled by imperial or noble personages or by powerful temples, succeeded through influence or favoritism in likewise securing charters for the estates, and the practice tended to spread.

[24] There were, from the eighth century, charters for the tilling of new land and of the grants of land to temples (see, *e. g.*, *Dai Nī-hon ko-mon zho*, V. 597, 639–645, 652–655, 767, VI. 597–598; *Zoku-zoku gun-zho rui-shū*, XI. 121; *Kō-bō dai-shi zen-shū*, I. 769–770; etc.), but the oldest *immunity*-charter that I have seen is dated 845 (see *Ko-mon zho rui-san*, third ed., p. 87), and it is difficult to duplicate the example from the ninth century.

[25] The full regular charters of a *shō* consisted of orders from the Grand Secretariat, from the Department of the Affairs of the People, and from the provincial and district authorities. Later there were charters less formal but none the less potent emanating directly from the emperor or the "cloistered" ex-emperor. In all regular procedure, a provincial official visited the estate with an agent of the *shō*, and put in stakes at its corners to mark its authorized extent. After the granting of the charters, local officials were not at liberty to enter the *shō* without special imperial sanction and without being accompanied by a representative of the estate.

[26] An example of a comprehensive charter occurs in 1050, which declared certain holdings of a temple "untaxable lands, free from intrusion by provincial envoys, and exempt from extraordinary miscellaneous services". *Kō-ya san mon-zho*, VII. 261–266.

[27] A *shō* belonging to a Shinto temple was, in 938, declared to have originally been a waste land which "for fifty years had been established as a *shō* and suffered no intrusion and examination". Unchartered *shō* of this kind became numerous. Often a great noble would disregard the formalities of invoking charters, and summarily order the meek provincial authorities to assist in the founding of a new *shō*. Provincial charters alone were not infrequently considered sufficient.

[28] Study the case of 845 referred to in note 24 above.

What further confirmed the status of the *shō* was the attempt of the emperor Go-Sanjō after 1069 to abolish all the *shō* established since 1045, and even those prior to that date that had no confirming charters. Unchartered *shō* were thus largely eliminated, and henceforth the possession of charters was regarded as a necessary concomitant of the existence or establishment of a *shō*; or, in other words, the *shō* was henceforth necessarily tax-immune in whole or in part. As fate would have it, the bicameral régime under three successive ex-emperors, which began soon after this date, happened to cause the number of *shō* to be greatly increased all over the country, marking a sudden and long progress in the creation of immune tracts of land.[29] In the middle of the twelfth century, immunity and the *shō* were almost interchangeable terms, so that all immune lands were alike called *shō*, and all private estates tended to become *shō*. The "imperial" and "granted" lands, the immune character of which, as I suppose, had originally furnished the model for the immune *shō*,[30] had now been completely absorbed by the latter. Not only that, but also the essentially private terminology that had grown up regarding the *shō* had come to be applied also to public administrative units of territory, even in official documents.

Secondly, as regards the private transfer of real rights concerning the *shō*. Immunity was a public right; its extension could not have been so complete as it was, nor could it have become a factor to bring about a feudal tenure of land, if immunity had not progressed, as it did, side by side with the private conveyance of certain real rights relative to the *shō*. These rights, however varied and however freely transferable they became in later years, may be presumed to have originally been derived from the fact of the first cultivation of the land in question The elementary forms of the rights were those in relation (1) to the use of the land and (2) to the dues in kind and in labor payable ultimately by the actual tillers of the soil. These and other real rights of the *shō*, when they became greatly diversified in later years, were collectively

[29] In an official record dated 1221, it is seen, for instance, that of the 86 public districts and private estates in the province of Noto, only two *shō* were established before 1050; eight estates, including very extensive *shō*, were founded apparently in the first half of the twelfth century; and the remaining 76 units were either made *shō* or, though still nominally public, treated much as if they also were private possessions, between 1186 and 1221. *Noto no kuni den-sō chō*, in *Shi-seki shū-ran* (revised), XXVII. 71–76.

[30] As a matter of fact, there were several other terms than *shō* that were applied to more or less immune estates, but their precise legal meanings are not yet clear, and probably cannot be determined in all cases; for a certain indefiniteness would naturally surround institutions whose origins were private and in part illegal.

called *shiki*. The transfer of *shiki* of a *shō* from one man to another may first have implied a separation of the right of some use of the land from its ownership. This separation once made, there was nothing to prevent further division, in the hands of many persons, of the various *shiki*, as, for example, the rights of the exploitation and of the control over the various dues, of the same *shō*.

As has been pointed out by Professor Nakada,[31] a distinction should be made between two kinds of transference of *shiki* according to the relative position in society of the persons effecting the transfer. The surrender of a *shiki* by one person of a lower station to another of a higher was termed *ki-shin*, which may almost literally be translated as commendation; a *shiki* granted by a higher person to a lower, for the purpose either of the management or of the economic exploitation of the *shō*, was often known as *on-kyū*, meaning benevolent gift, for which we shall use the term benefice. It will at once be observed that there was a wide difference, in their institutional origin, between commendation and conferring of benefice.

1. The primary aims of commendation were to secure protection and insure immunity. Protection oftener than immunity seems to have been the chief object of a common form of commendation which appears to have gradually shaped itself in the tenth century. According to this, the owner nominally gave up his *shō* to a stronger personage, for one generation or more, in order, as said the accompanying document, "to borrow his might and influence" or "to put a stop to the outrages of the provincial officials", but in fact reserved for himself his *shiki* as steward or bailiff of the *shō*. In form, the commendor surrendered ownership and retained the right of use; in reality, he retained possession and delivered only a part of the dues from the land. On his part, the receiving person often bound himself by a written document to forfeit his nominal ownership of the commended land, should he presume to meddle with its management, which rested as before in the hands of the commendor.

As immunity became more prevalent and more widely coveted, it was a growing tendency among holders of *shō* to mount higher in the ascending steps of their commendations until they should reach an imperial personage, a great temple, or a noble person above the third rank. It was in this manner that *shiki* of a *shō* came to be diversified and to be distributed among several persons and institutions, always with a high immune personage at the apex (*hon-sho*

[31] Professor K. Nakada's able paper was published in various numbers of vol. XX. of the *Kokka gak'-kwai zasshi*. I acknowledge my indebtedness to him in so far as regards the larger legal aspects of commendation and the benefice.

or *hon-ke*), who was able to override the local governor.[32] As immunity was becoming sometimes judicial and administrative as well as financial, commendation of this kind seems to have tended to prevail everywhere, and in fact, after the eleventh century, helped immunity itself to extend with facility. At the end of the twelfth, there could have been few *shō* which had not found their nominal immune owners; in fact, it was the boast of Fujiwara nobles that they controlled numerous *shō* but managed none themselves.[33] It should be remembered that the original commendors had usually contrived to retain their management and possession.

In any instance, it will be noted that the Japanese commendation was essentially contractual in character, and created a freer status for the commendor than was usually the case with commendation in medieval Europe, with further characteristic differences. The commendor, as has been seen, transferred to the commendee certain specified rights, but retained for himself other real rights of the same land; these reserved rights he was free to dispose of as he pleased, by means of commendations to other persons; and the several commendees thus created were likewise able to divide and convey to others the rights they had received—the result of this flexible arrangement, even aside from the conditions due to other causes that encumbered the normal *shō*, being often a network of customary rights of bewildering complexity.[34]

2. The benefice,[35] pure and simple, of *shiki* of the *shō* may be said to have originated with the privileges its owner granted to the men

[32] In 1017 people of a *shō* in Kii under the powerful noble Michinaga complained to him about a certain action of a provincial magnate, whereupon he summoned the latter to Kyōto. *Mi-dō kwan-paku ki*, Yale MS., bk. 15. In 1070 priests of Tō-dai-zhi invaded a district in Iga with a band of lawless men, arbitrarily determined the boundaries of a *shō* which the temple claimed, and maltreated a provincial official, robbing him of his horse and clothes; the government at Kyōto was unable to punish the culprits. T. Yoshida, *Tō-jo Ni-hon shi*, VIII. 268.

[33] When, in 1185, Fujiwara Kanezane was offered by Yoritomo the stewardship of a *shō* belonging to an imperial consort, he expressed his chagrin in his diary thus: "It would be exceedingly ugly to make me Steward of Her Ladyship's *shō*; there never has been such a thing in the family." *Gyoku-yō*, chap. 42.

[34] It requires all the analytical power one can command to follow the maze of the astonishingly intricate tenures pertaining, for example, to the *shō* of Kamino and Makuni, through documents scattered over the eight volumes of *Kō-ya san mon-zho*. The same may be said of any of the larger *shō* belonging to Kō-ya-san, Tō-zhi, or Iwashimidzu. A full analysis of the tenures of Shimadzu *shō* in southern Kyūshū would fill a large volume.

[35] Professor Nakada's treatment of this precarious tenure is specially lucid (see *Kokka gak'-kwai zasshi*, XX. ix, 66–90), but nearly all the sources he cites are dated after the thirteenth century. The general features of the tenure are well shown, but there is much to be studied as to the exact nature and evolution

who were employed in the actual management and cultivation of the land. These employees appear ever since the early part of the eighth century under a great variety of names; their services were rewarded with the use of pieces of land in the *shō*, with certain portions of its dues, or in produce or money. Their appointment and support were, though accompanied by a written form, founded on no mutual agreement, and were regarded purely as an act of favor on the part of the master, granted, as was explicitly stated in the charter, for the employee's earnest "prayer". By the act of accepting the benefice, therefore, the grantee imposed upon himself one-sided, precarious obligations;[36] the relation established by the act was more real than personal, and at first one rather of fact than of right. When the use of land was allowed, it could in no wise be looked upon as rented; and the furthest extent that the grantor's favor could reach was for him to state that the tenure of the land would be contingent upon the performance of his duties. The Japanese *on-kyū* thus closely resembled the *precarium* of medieval Europe, revocable at will; even when the practice later tended toward a hereditary holding of the privileges, in Japan as in Europe, the original precarious nature of the grant was often maintained in form.

When one considers that commendation and beneficing were in simultaneous practice, he may well imagine real rights created by both exercised side by side within the same *shō*. Such was indeed true. This is not to say, however, that they readily merged into or materially influenced each other. As a matter of fact, till far along into the feudal period, the tenures in all their complexity of these two different origins persisted independently, though in close juxtaposition.[37] The resulting *shō* was not a manorial or-

of the more important classes of the *on-kyū*. For this study, the abundant materials in possession of those historic Buddhist temples in Japan which were great holders of land constitute indispensable though difficult sources of information.

[36] It is, for example, instructive to compare, through their oaths of allegiance dated between 1265 and 1315, the relatively freer tenure of the *Ban-gashira* and other officials with the more precarious condition of the *Sō-tsui-ho shi*, the *Ku-mon*, and their agents, in the *shō* of Kamino and Makuni. See *Kō-ya san mon-zho*, I. 503–518, VII. 187–197, 199–214, 216–223, 225–226. Both classes of officials lived upon the *shō*, and many of them were original possessors of parts of the land and had held their posts for generations, but the first class consisted of direct representatives of landholders, and the second, of beneficed agents.

[37] For instance, glance over the succinct comments attached to the numerous estates controlled by the regent Michi-iye, in his testament dated 1250, and note the diversity of conditions brought about through division and transfer by generations of holders of lands and real rights which had originally been created by cultivation, purchase, commendation, or beneficing. *Ko-mon-zho rui-san* (third ed.), pp. 285–316.

ganization comprising strips of arable land laid out and administered by the joint intervention of the lord and the half-free tenants, but a large unit[38] in a "scattered farm" system, which was an agglomeration of fields of utmost irregularity in form and size and of great diversity in origin and actual condition; the interference of the community for the division and management of all of its land had little opportunity to develop in an organization where comparatively free and unfree tenures persisted side by side.

Now the crucial question arises: How, then, did the feudal land-tenure originate? The fief, as we find it in the Japan of subsequent ages, aside from its military relation, was practically contractual, and was hereditary and capable of subinfeudation,[39] while the benefice was, even in its later state, essentially precarious, and non-divisible without special sanction, though often hereditary. Could the one flow out of the other in the process of normal evolution? When the armed man entered the estate, was the fief naturally born of the benefice? In Europe results of commendations may have been readily assimilated to the common precarious status and have lost traces of their separate origin; but in Japan the tenure of commendation was decidedly freer, being specific, divisible, and transferable, and was inclined to maintain intact its own genealogy of rights and obligations. If merging did not take place on any large scale, where could the fief have arisen? The study of the whole question is more complex than it appears, and its definite institutional features remain still practically unexplored. I shall essay to evolve a working hypothesis by examining briefly the process by which the private warrior made his appearance on the scene and the conditions under which he gained control over landed institutions.

IV.

The exact institutional aspects of the rise of the Japanese warrior are not so clear as is generally assumed among scholars in Japan; nor is it the purpose of this paper to discuss them in detail. It will suffice to indicate the probable relation of the subject to that of land tenure. The Japanese warrior was, like the *shō*,

[38] The extents of the five *shō* established in Noto between 1136 and 1146 ranged between 60 and 400 acres, and one was as large as 1000 acres. See reference in note 29 above. These were among the larger *shō*.

[39] In 1206 the Shōgun's government ruled that no landed possession granted by the late suzerain would be revoked, except in case of a grave offense. *Adzuma-kagami*, XVIII., in *Zoku koku-shi tai-kei*, IV. 673. In the official manual of the feudal government of 1232 (*Jō-ei shiki-moku*), the right of the military holder of land to divide it among his children and relatives is admitted (in c. XX., XXII., and XXVI.), and his right of sub-granting it is implied (in c. XIX.).

which he later controlled, largely private in origin; he had his illicit birth in the social unrest that had resulted from the unforeseen failure of the reformed state established in the seventh century to secure peace and order. No sooner had the Reform been instituted than the nobility and clergy began to extend their control over a rapidly enlarging portion of taxable land and taxable people at the cost of the state.[40] The latter's expenditures, on the other hand, greatly increased from the eighth century. The burden of taxation was felt with growing heaviness by those people who still remained under the state's control and whose number was rapidly falling off. Those who would desert their allotted lands, but were unable to attach themselves to nobles and temples, drifted away as outlaws. The growth of this floating population had become alarming already at the beginning of the eighth century, and the government's efforts to restore order were unavailing, even at the capital. The society was restless, police laws were defied, and official soldiers[41] proved utterly ineffective against the deepening disorder.

[40] In 1197, that is, soon after the beginning of the feudal rule of Japan, the proportions of land under official control in the provinces of Satsuma, Osumi, and Hyūga, were, respectively, as follows: 5 per cent., 8 per cent., and .3 per cent. See *Ken-kyū dzu-den chō*, in *Shi-seki shū-ran* (revised), XXVII. 46–70. The following provinces were more fortunate: Tajima, 4 per cent.; Bungo, 12.5 per cent.; Hitachi, 22.5 per cent. See T. Yoshida, *Dai Ni-hon chi-mei zhi-sho*, introduction, p. 77. In these cases, the remainder of the areas consisted of *shō* and other species of more or less immune land; nor was the "official" land entirely taxable.

Earlier instances follow: an official report from Etchū in 1050 says that, owing to the recent rise of *shō* in the province, "people for public labor are scarce, and taxable land is very little". *Kan-chū ki*, in *Etchū shi-ryō*, I. 211–212. In 1107 the province of Kii reported that, of its seven districts, "six have each eight-or nine-tenths become *shō*. . . . Especially in the two districts of Ito and Naka . . . one or two villages only are left." The seventh district is also honeycombed with *shō*. *Kō-ya san mon-zho*, IV. 244–245.

The taxable population given in the Chinese dynastic history of Sung from a Japanese source was, at the end of the tenth century, 883,329. The entire population of this general period has been estimated as not less than four or five millions. There is little doubt that the population was increasing, but the decrease of the taxable population recorded in the census was alarming. In 914 a councillor stated that, out of the Ki-nai, Kyūshū, and the two northern provinces, there were only 300,000 registered taxable people, of whom, owing to the amazing inaccuracy of the census, more than a half were non-existent. He cites the case of a town in Bitchū, which in 647 could furnish 20,000 able-bodied, adult men, but in a hundred years saw its taxable population reduced to 1900, in another century to 70, and in 911 had not a soul registered. Miyoshi Kiyoyasu's memorial, in *Hon-chō bun-sui* (1888), II. 11–12.

[41] Official soldiers levied from among the people by a system of conscription were abolished in 739 and 792, except in the two northernmost provinces and in the islands of Sato and Kyūshū; those in the last were reduced almost by one-half in 814. Minor varieties of official military forces proved as useless, and all gave way, so soon as the early ninth century, before the growing disorder and the private warriors.

As things grew worse, it became a universal custom for the more competent among the country folk to provide themselves with arms for protection, though the private use of weapons was unlawful. It should be remembered that among the free citizens in the country there were many of noble and even imperial descent,[42] who possessed large tracts of land[43] and numbers of dependent people,[44] and who had added to their prestige by serving at the capital as guardsmen or other temporary officials.[45] The government depended in a large measure for peace in the provinces on these very people.[46] Among these the less responsible men became themselves disturbers of peace, especially when they had commended their land and themselves to temples or court nobles, and were thus enabled to defy provincial officials with impunity. The latter, accordingly, when they were appointed to their posts, often proceeded thither, in defiance of law, with their male relatives capable of bearing arms.[47] These would permanently settle in the provinces; the governors themselves, who should be transferred elsewhere at the end of their terms, tended to hold their office by heredity. In these two classes of local magnates, old and new, who often quarrelled among themselves and against one another, may be seen origins of the warriors (*bu-shi*) so largely private and illegal in character. Another and perhaps more important source must be sought in those who had seen service in the frontier garrisons of Kyūshū and the northern provinces; especially in the latter, where the Ainos resisted Japanese encroachment with tenacity, colonization of outlaws from other parts of the country was encouraged on a large scale, and great expeditions against the turbulent tribes were repeatedly organized, during

[42] References to descendants of the pre-Reform nobility and of imperial personages are innumerable in the records. Governors of districts (*kōri*) mostly were local celebrities and held their posts by heredity.

[43] When in the early eighth century the cultivation of new land was encouraged with promises of grant of ranks, there came forth men who had opened surprisingly large tracts.

[44] With much local variation, the remains of the census of the eighth century reveal at times the existence of great numbers of the unfree in individual families.

[45] The number of those who had at one time or another filled metropolitan posts and who had returned to the provinces as privileged men was large. In the early tenth century, nearly 3000 such men yearly left the capital.

[46] The official soldiery being inefficient, the authorities were compelled, from the last part of the eighth century, to enlist the service of the more wealthy men in the provinces who were skilled in arms.

[47] The violation of law in this respect may be inferred as early as 719 (see *Rui-zhū san-dai kyaku*, in *Koku-shi tai-kei*, XII. 646 ff.). Explicit and repeated prohibitions of this offense during the two ensuing centuries were unavailing; then, as will be seen later, the practice furnished, from the tenth century, the very foundation of a feudal nobility.

the eighth and ninth centuries, with men from among the colonists and from the neighboring regions. These men and their descendants, as well as chiefs of the Ainos who had surrendered, became professional warriors, at first half official in nature but later purely private. Court nobles, who were engaged in keen rivalry among themselves for political power at the capital, sought to augment their revenue, as well as enhance their prestige, by controlling numerous *shō* in the country, which were well protected by armed men, and by otherwise allying themselves with local chieftains. Many a Fujiwara noble himself sought the provincial governorship, settled his male relatives, and implanted his influence, especially in regions north and east of Kyōto.[48] Such was the condition about 900.

Thereafter, with the parallel extension of immunity and commendation, we may note more and more warriors included in the *shō*. Some had themselves been commendors of land; others had been invested with *shiki* by the legal owners of estates.[49] We may suppose that, in the latter class of cases, the employment of warriors as agents of the *shō* was opportune as protection against the prevailing disorder, for the warrior in the *shō* would be as efficient for its security as he would be dangerous out of the *shō* as a marauder. He probably served also as a safeguard against the original commendors, who, as the actual possessors of the land, had often shown little scruple, when they were able, to terminate their agreements with the nominal owners and enter into contractual relations with other nobles or temples.[50] It should be remembered, however, that nearly all the owners of the *shō* under whom warriors served as stewards and agents still belonged either to the civil nobility or to the clergy, and that there as yet existed no military nobility.

[48] See the vivid story told a little later of a Fujiwara chieftain in Etchū in *Kon-zhaku mono-gatari*, vol. XXVI., no. 17. His descendants lorded over the three adjoining provinces.

[49] The case of the contiguous *shō* of Kanino, Makuni, and Sarukawa, is typical. They grew around cultivated tracts that had been commended before the twelfth century to a monastery by their warrior-owners. From this time to the beginning of the fourteenth century, numerous documents reveal the descendants of the commendors and other armed men as "residents" (*jū-nin*), "land-holders" (*ji-nushi*), and *hyaku-shō* (bearers of family-names ?), these terms being often used interchangeably. Some of them acted as representatives of their rank; some were appointed as agents (often faithless) of the monastery. Many of the actual tillers of the soil were in a servile position. See *Kō-ya san mon-zho*, I., doc. nos. 447–450; VII., doc. nos. 1581, 1583–1590, 1592–1600, 1604, 1607–1608, 1610, 1612, 1615, 1619, 1623–1624.

[50] In 1106, an agent of Kasawara *shō* was dismissed for an offense, and, in his chagrin, commended the *shō* to a temple.

V.

The tenth century was just witnessing the beginning of a new class of nobility which was military almost from the date of its birth —though its military character was essentially private—and which rose in influence with rapidity in the next century and a half. Certain political and economic exigencies of the court impelled many members of the imperial family, from the early eighth century on, to renounce their privilege, to assume new family-names, and to become nobles of inferior rank. Of these, the more ambitious at once sought fortune away from the capital, after the tenth century, both as local officials, whose terms they helped to make hereditary,[51] and as managers of great *shō*.[52] In the latter capacity, the position of the new nobles, living as they did on the ground, was certain to become much stronger than that of the absentee civil owners of the *shō*. In both capacities—as governors of *kuni* and as stewards of *shō*—the new nobles were armed men, for to arms the times had driven all men of ambition in the provinces. During the tenth century, the military nobles, though in the main belonging to the two families Minamoto and Taira, were, as was revealed at the rebellion of Masakado in 939–940, still largely unorganized, and their alliance with the local warriors, who had first grown up independently of them, was still limited though increasing. The military nobility was as yet hardly in a position to cope with the civil nobility.

The situation changed rapidly from the eleventh century, when the increasing restlessness among all classes of the people impelled the more active men to unmake and remake alliances in manners that seemed to suit their interest best. The actual possessors of the *shō*, who had once commended their land to civil nobles or temples, now largely transferred similar *shiki* to military nobles;[53] and the deed was done with ease, as the *shiki* were in the process of becoming more flexible and divisible than ever. The mutual advantage of the new arrangement seemed evident, for thereby the possessor,

[51] The first Taira (899), the first Minamoto (first half of the tenth century), and their sons, all filled posts in the local government, to say nothing of their descendants.

[52] To cite only two instances from the tenth century. Hidesato was steward of the strategic Tawara *shō*, while being constable of Shimotsuke, and in this double capacity was a powerful tool in eastern Japan in the hands of the Fujiwara nobles. Mitsunaka, a provincial governor, managed Tada *shō*, and was a faithful servant to his Fujiwara chiefs.

[53] Already in 1091 the government at Kyōto forbade the people in the provinces, with little effect, to make further commendations of landed rights to the Minamoto chief. *Hyaku-ren shō*, V., in *Koku-shi tai-kei*, XIV. 55. From the early years of the next century similar prohibitions were as frequent as unavailing.

who was himself a warrior, secured a new master who was always at hand, affording constant protection and manifesting kindred interest and sympathy, and under whose growing prestige it was an honor to serve; the warrior-lord, too, was enabled by this method to include more land and more men under his control. Actual warfare, which was then becoming frequent, accelerated the process once so naturally begun. For during the protracted campaigns in the north, the men were thrown together in a close relationship; even in those local warriors who had joined the expedition merely from motives of opportunism was gradually engendered a feeling of personal loyalty to the chieftains; while the latter's interest had become increasingly bound up with that of the warrior class as a whole as against the civil nobility. Landed possessions and personal following grew henceforth in a rapid process of accretion; the private organization of men and land gained, on the one hand, in hierarchical unity under the impetus of the revived spirit of clannism, and, on the other, in complex divisions of families and their *shiki* in land.

We shall not discuss here the personal side of the new relationship—the forms of fealty and protection between lord and vassal, and the question of the knight's service. What should specially be noted is the effect of the social changes upon land tenure.

First, let us consider the position of the military lord serving as protector and manager of a *shō* nominally owned by a temple or a civil noble of the court. The former was an invested agent of the latter, and his position was accordingly precarious in principle; the *shiki* which the manager enjoyed were presumed to have originally been granted as a favor, not as a reward for service; and the charter creating his tenure and his own acknowledgment of the charter explicitly stated that his office would terminate with a lapse from duteous conduct.[54] However, even the tillers and their chiefs, employed, as they were, for the mere economic exploitation of the soil, whose servile tenure was stated as revocable when they failed in duty, are seen to have often held their place, after the twelfth century, by heredity. For the manager, who supervised these men, there were, as a matter of course, circumstances which deprived his tenure of its seeming precariousness. He was himself a noble, and, as such, usually found benefice in an extensive *shō*[55] comprising

[54] Even so late as in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries the charters and acknowledgments of military managerships of ecclesiastical *shō* were often plainly precarious in expression. See, *e. g.*, those of 1363, in *Iwashimidzu mon-zho*, I. 283; and of 1359 and 1462–1463, in *Tō-zhi hyaku-go mon-zho*, MSS., part *ro*.

[55] A striking instance is that of the great *shō* of Shimadzu in southern Kyūshū. About 1025 a local official cultivated a tract in this region, and com-

numerous tracts and people of diverse origins and conditions; his authority as manager of affairs and leader of armed men was necessarily great. When he was, in addition, an hereditary high official of a province, and, as often happened, had the management of many *shō* within its confines,[56] his position was commanding. Even in a less pretentious place, he usually gathered about him relatives and other dependents that, along with his sworn men, squatted on the *shō*-all of whom he could mobilize at an instant's notice. The civil noble at Kyōto would think twice before interfering with his agent in the country whose post seemed so impregnable. The latter showed at times a disposition to invade neighboring estates for purposes of plunder at the head of hundreds of mounted warriors; might not the same force perhaps be turned against the nominal master at court? The position of the chief as manager, therefore, was far from precarious, was often stronger than a contractual tenure, and was perforce hereditary, as was also that of the many men under his military control who would rise and fall with their lord. All this had come about by an irresistible force of necessity, in which the civil and religious owners of the *shō* had no choice but to acquiesce.

Consider, next, the case of the small warrior serving under a military noble who was either the manager or the owner of the *shō*. His relation to the lord was either that of a commendor and possessor of land or that of a beneficed servant. The distinction between these two kinds of status was indeed maintained at least till the end of the Kamakura period in the early fourteenth century. During that same period, however, the growing tendency was toward the gradual approach of the tenure of possession to the more precarious tenure of the invested *shiki* in land. In the feudal official manual of 1232, the hereditary possession of the immediate

mended it to the regent Yorimichi, reserving for himself and his descendants the right of its financial management. Gradually annexing estates of different origins and tenures, the *shō* came to include the greater part of the three provinces, Satsuma, Ōsumi, and Hyūga, comprising a variety of possessors and beneficed agents. Of these agents, a family which assumed the name Shimadzu became conspicuous toward the end of the twelfth century as the managers-general of the entire *shō*. During the troublous fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, the Shimadzu succeeded in reducing their rivals within the vast *shō* and making themselves its sole possessors. In this position they were respected and feared by the Tokugawa shogunate all during its rule after 1600, and finally were instrumental in accomplishing its downfall in 1867–1868.

[56] As a result of subtle divisions of real rights, civil and religious owners often found it convenient to bundle several *shō* that were near together and to place over them a military manager. Not infrequently Minamoto and Taira chiefs in this way had the management of all the *shō* in whole districts and provinces, of which they were governors for generations.

vassal of the suzerain, but not his beneficed *shiki*, might be transferred by sale;[57] from 1270 onward, neither could be so conveyed,[58] while both could, as before, be divided and bequeathed among children—the law of primogeniture not having as yet been fully established—and be subinfeudated.[59] This trend of assimilating the two tenures and bringing about a gradual evolution of a tenure less free than the one and less precarious than the other, that came to a marked stage in the thirteenth century and completed itself in the fifteenth and sixteenth, may, it is surmised, have shown its faint beginnings in the early period under our discussion.[60] It would seem probable that in the personal relation in military service between manager-lord and vassal, the latter as a commendor and possessor of land could not, even in this early period, be nearly as independent as he had been under the absentee civil or religious master; while, as a beneficed servant, he would be likely to be treated with more consideration by his new lord, for the former's service was deemed honorable, was akin to that of the latter, and was directly needed in as efficient a form as possible.

To sum up the foregoing discussion. The fiscal immunity of "imperial", "granted", and "temple" lands induced the commendation of taxable land and people into growing private estates. The state, seeing its sources of revenue and power fast dwindling away, itself adopted the methods of the nobility and clergy to administer public affairs much as if they were private concerns. The inveterate habit of the political mind of the pre-Reform age seemed to have returned in full vitality. In their disposition of the rights and facts relating to land, the Japanese displayed their genius in an arrangement of remarkable flexibility with a large capacity for compromise. And this very condition made it a matter of ease for a firm hold on private land to be established by the warrior, another illegal creation of the age unforeseen by the Reformers. A little later arose a military nobility, which, in a century and a half, made itself the central power by the double method of serving, on the one hand, as the political and proprietary agents of the civil nobility at Kyōto, and, on the other, of assuming lordship over the warriors in the country. As agent, the military noble approached the position of the possessor of the land in his charge; as lord, he was tending to make the ten-

[57] *Jō-ei shiki-moku*, c. XLVIII.

[58] *Shin-pen tsui-ka*, c. LXV., LXXVII., LXXIV., LXXV.

[59] See note 39 above.

[60] I have been unable to substantiate this surmise from the available contemporary sources, which relate chiefly to civil and ecclesiastical *shō* and rarely to those of military ownership. I hold the theory as a probable supposition till I may find it either confirmed or disproved by fresh evidence.

ures of his commendor-vassal and of his beneficed vassal alike a favor in theory, though in practice a reward, alike accompanying a military service, and alike hereditary and divisible, though inalienable by sale. In short, the military noble was in the process of becoming the lord of a fief capable of subinfeudation. The process was slow to mature, for the civil and religious estates still persisted, though in decreasing numbers, and continued to offer some resistance to the encroachment of the new tenure; the complete assimilation of the land of Japan into the feudal tenure was not effected until the sixteenth century, and was quickly followed by another development. We suspect, however, that, when all the sources shall some day be brought to light, beginnings of the long process may perhaps be discerned as early as in the period ending in 1186.

VI.

We have sketched the main outlines of the evolution of landed institutions before the advent of the feudal régime. It now remains to touch very briefly upon the general movement of historical events in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, which hastened the processes that have been described and which culminated in the inception of the régime in 1186.

In the eleventh century, social unrest had become more organized as the military forces of the great warrior-clans were better co-ordinated, and broke out in serious insurrections, in 1028, 1052–1061, and 1088–1091. Most of the leaders of the rebels were men of the new nobility, and were vanquished only by other men of their class commanding their own warriors. The enervated civil nobles at Kyōto were Buddhists of the old type and abhorred the sight of blood. They were compelled to depend on the Minamoto and Taira, not only for the suppression of local disorders, but also in their mutual rivalry and intrigue for power. The military nobles were not only establishing their influence in the country, but also becoming a decisive factor in the political struggles at Kyōto; they were not only owners and stewards of *shō*, but also indispensable tools for the Fujiwara nobles and imperial aspirants for supremacy at court, to whom the warlords had sold their temporary fealty.

Events since the early eleventh century resulted in driving the Minamoto and Taira clans to organize themselves in larger and larger groups, finally dividing military Japan between them into two distinct spheres of influence, the Minamoto in the east and the Taira in the west. Presently, the political factions at the capital, which employed the arms of the two clans, came twice to a sharp conflict, in 1156 and in 1160, that decided the ascendancy of

the Taira for a brief quarter of a century, to be followed by a more complete and lasting supremacy of the Minamoto. In this swift flight of events, the civil nobility was thrust into the background as a political factor and dispossessed of many of its landed estates, the power of the great temples was curbed, and the fortune of military families rose and fell with tragic rapidity. The real rights of *shō* changed hands on large scales,[61] the warriors in the meantime gaining an extended control over them; vassals transferred their allegiance in large numbers and with frequency; and the immunity of the *shō*, especially of those owned by warriors, usually amounted to political autonomy. Finally, in 1186, Minamoto-no-Yoritomo compelled the reluctant imperial government to sanction his appointing his own vassals as constables in all the provinces, and as stewards of all the *shō*, civil, religious, and military,[62] in Japan. With this her feudal rule may be said to have begun.

K. Asakawa.

[61] The Taira appointed their vassals as stewards, not only over their own *shō*, but also over civil and religious *shō* (see *Adzuma kagami*, V., in *Zoku koku-shi tai-kei*, IV. 197), and over the *shō* confiscated from their former lords. The family is said to have held governorships of 36 out of the 66 provinces of Japan, and controlled [*shiki* of] more than 500 *shō*, besides innumerable minor estates. All these extensive *shiki* were confiscated from the *Taira* at their downfall, and passed under the control of the Minamoto.

[62] Beginning shortly after 1186, the newly appointed stewards (*ji-tō*) seem to have been gradually withdrawn from some of the civil and ecclesiastical *shō*. (See, for example, the withdrawal in 1227 from the *shō* belonging to a monastery, in *Kō-ya san mon-zho*, VII. 182, 253.) The suzerain, however, continued to hold, through the new constables (*shu-go*), the military and police power over all the provinces, which comprised within them all the existent *shō*.

THE GOVERNMENT OF NORMANDY UNDER HENRY II.[1]

I.

In the great Plantagenet empire of the twelfth century Normandy held the central place, mediating historically, as well as geographically, between the England which it had conquered a century earlier and the Angevin and Aquitanian lands which shared its Frankish traditions and were beginning to feel with it the nascent centripetal power of the French monarchy. The beginnings of this empire were the result of Norman initiative, and upon Normandy fell the brunt of the attacks under which it collapsed. Yet Normandy, though central, was not dominant. It was bound to its neighbors, not merely by a personal union, but by a common imperial policy, by certain elements of a common administration, and by constant communication and interchange of officials; and it took its place by their side as a member of the strongest and most remarkable state of its time. Be our interest military or economic, ecclesiastical or constitutional, we cannot hope to understand any part of this realm without constant reference to the other parts and to the whole. What is true of the several countries is true of their sovereign. Henry II. has too often been viewed merely as an English king, yet he was born and educated on the Continent, began to rule on the Continent, and spent a large part of his later life in his Continental dominions. He was, of course, not a foreigner, as was William the Conqueror, and England had a share in forming him which it had not in the making of his great-grandfather; yet he is not a national figure, either English or French—he is international, if not cosmopolitan.

It is natural that Henry's reign should have been most thoroughly studied in the land where his descendants still rule, but it is significant of his wider influence that the Continental relations of his legal reforms were first clearly seen by a German jurist, and that the greatest French scholar of our time should have begun his long life of labor with a study of Henry's financial administration and closed it by dedicating to the Continental documents of his reign a masterly volume of the *Chartes et Diplômes relatifs à l'Histoire de*

[1] In a briefer form, this paper was read before the International Congress of Historical Studies at London in April, 1913.

France. Where Brunner and Delisle are masters, one can do no more than follow; yet this period of Norman history is not exhausted, as Professor Powicke has recently shown us, and one may still seek to contribute a bit of new evidence or a new suggestion to the understanding of what will always be a reign of uncommon interest. In presenting the results of any such study much depends on the point of view. When the institutions of Normandy approach those of its Continental neighbors, they will impress the English student more than they impress the French, while other elements which seem familiar and hence commonplace to an English writer become highly significant when seen against a Continental background. The point of view of the present paper is English in the sense that it examines the government of Normandy under Henry II. particularly for light which may be thrown upon the government of England in the same period, and, while it is based upon an independent exploration of the available evidence, it will pass lightly over matters which are already well established[2] or which, like the fiscal system, are interesting chiefly by way of contrast to Continental conditions.

The great obstacle to any careful study of Normandy in the twelfth century is the paucity of original information, especially as contrasted with the wealth of record in contemporary England. For Henry's reign the only Norman chronicle is that of Robert of Torigni,[3] pieced out by occasional local annals and by the casual references of English writers to Norman affairs, and there is little to add in the form of letters[4] or other literary remains. Over against the splendid series of the Pipe Rolls, unbroken after 1155, Normandy can show only the Exchequer Roll of 1180 and two fragments of 1184.[5] There is no *Dialogue on the Exchequer* and no Glanvill, and

[2] For the fiscal system Delisle's study, "Des Revenus publics en Normandie au XII[e] Siècle", *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, X., XI., XIII., is still fundamental. For legal matters Valin, *Le Duc de Normandie et sa Cour*, is useful, though inadequate in its use of materials and at times too juristic. Powicke's *Loss of Normandy*, supplemented at certain points by his articles in the *English Historical Review* (XXI. 635–649, XXII. 15–42), gives the best survey of the Angevin period but treats constitutional matters less fully than other aspects of the subject.

[3] Cited from Delisle's edition (Société de l'Histoire de Normandie, Rouen, 1872–1873).

[4] The letters of Arnulf of Lisieux, for example, are disappointing.

[5] Cited from the edition of Stapleton, *Magni Rotuli Scaccarii Normanniae sub Regibus Angliae* (London, 1840–1844); the second fragment of 1184 from Delisle's *Henri II.*, pp. 334–344. That the Exchequer had other types of rolls appears from the notice of 1186 printed by Delisle, *Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions*, XXIV. 2, 353; and by Valin, p. 278.

the earliest custumal is not earlier than 1199.[6] The charters are fairly numerous, in originals, in cartulary copies, or in the *vidimus* of French kings, and an admirable basis for their study now exists in Léopold Delisle's *Introduction*,[7] soon to be followed by the publication of the full texts; yet of those here analyzed the four hundred or more which relate to Normandy are an insignificant part of the thousands which once existed and from which it would have been possible to reconstruct the whole course of administrative and judicial procedure in the Norman state. The charters of bishops and barons and lesser persons are more numerous and offer much to reward the investigator of local and family history and of legal and economic relations, but they too often tell us what we least want to know, and the result of prolonged explorations is in many respects disappointing.

Equally fatal is the loss of Henry's Norman legislation. At best, as Maitland has reminded us,[8] his law-making was done in an informal fashion and has left few monuments, even in England, and for Normandy the only formal ordinances that have been preserved are the Continental prototypes of the Assize of Arms and the regulations concerning the Saladin tithe.[9] Here again time has dealt unkindly with records which are known to have existed. The Bec annalist tells of the Christmas court at Falaise in 1159, whose acts he evidently had before him in writing his provokingly meagre summary,[10] and three years later we hear of a Lenten assembly at Rouen which seems to have had legislative importance.[11] There was probably, as we shall see, some specific assize establishing the use of the recognition, and tenure by *parage* seems to have been introduced by a definite statute.[12] Now and then, in an age when no line was drawn between legislation and adjudication, there are instances of general enactments in the form of judicial decisions.[13]

[6] Tardif, *Le Très Ancien Coutumier*, in his *Coutumiers de Normandie*, I. (Rouen, 1881).

[7] *Recueil des Actes de Henri II. Roi d' Angleterre et Duc de Normandie concernant les Provinces Françaises et les Affaires de France, Introduction* (with a fascicle of facsimiles, Paris, 1909). Unless otherwise indicated, references to Delisle are to this volume.

[8] *History of English Law* (second ed.), I. 136. On the legislation of the dukes of Normandy see Tardif, *Étude sur les Sources de l'Ancien Droit Normand*, read before the Congrès du Millénaire in 1911, of which the part covering Henry II. has not yet appeared.

[9] Benedict of Peterborough, I. 269, II. 30. *Cf.* also the general ordinance concerning the debts of Crusaders issued at Verneuil in 1177, *ibid.*, I. 194.

[10] Robert of Torigni, II. 180.

[11] *Ibid.*, I. 336.

[12] Powicke, *Loss of Normandy*, p. 69.

[13] See Robert of Torigni, II. 241; the various reforms attributed to William Fitz Ralph in the *Très Ancien Coutumier*, cc. 60–65; and the following unpublished example from an original in the Archives of the Manche, H. 3 (1165–1179):

Next to the Exchequer Rolls, the fullest information respecting Norman institutions under Henry was contained in the returns from the great general inquests ordered at different occasions in his reign. One of these, the inquest of 1172 concerning military tenures, has long been known and used, but for the others we have little more than a bare mention. In Normandy, as later in England, the new ruler began at once the gradual recovery of the lost portions of his demesne through the machinery of the sworn inquest; and we have record of such inquests held at Caen before 1154 to determine the duke's rights at Bayeux,[14] and, then or shortly afterward, throughout the Bessin,[15] while in 1163 two of his justices made inquiry, diocese by diocese, concerning the rents and customs pertaining to the duke and his barons.[16] This was not entirely effectual, and in 1171 the income of the duchy was almost doubled by an inquest held throughout Normandy to ascertain the lands and forest and other portions of the demesne which had been occupied since the death of Henry I.[17] Of this systematic survey we are fortunate in having, besides the references in the Exchequer Rolls[18] and possible indications in cartularies[19] and in the *Coutumier des Forêts* of Hector of Chartres,[20] the

"Reverentissimo patri suo et domino carissimo R. Rothomagensi archiepiscopo et omnibus hoc audientibus et recte iudicantibus Willelmus de Sola salutem. Testimonium cuiusdam donationis quam feci monachis de Alneto vobis per litteras meas significare curavi. Habebam quondam in manu mea et adhuc habere poteram si voluissem duas garbas decime in parrochia de Bono Fosseio ex quibus unam dedi monachis et aliam ecclesie eiusdem ville, persona vero ecclesie suam terciam garbam habuit sibi in pace et habet. Verum tunc temporis talis erat consuetudo circa nos quod tercia tantum garba reddebatur persone, de illis scilicet terris que pro campardo tradebantur, due vero cum eodem campardo tenebantur, que nunc Deo donante et domino rege nostro iudicante ubique in territoriis nostris redduntur, quas monachi et ecclesia in suam partem volunt habere. Quod quidem rectissimum videtur sed persona contradicit ill[is]. Quam contentionem declarandam domino Ricardo Constantiensi episcopo commiseram et non semel aut secundo me donationem attestante coram ipso iudicium distulit facere. Qua de causa monachi in eius curia aggravati cum Gaufrido milite persona vestram appellaverunt presentiam. Unde obnixe vestram deprecor auctoritatem quatinus vos pro Deo quod unicuique pertinet et persone et monachis et ecclesie recta consideratione restituatis. Valete."

[14] *Livre Noir de Bayeux*, nos. 13, 138; Delisle, Table, no. 72*.

[15] *Livre Noir*, no. 35; Delisle, no. 34.

[16] Robert of Torigni, I. 344.

[17] *Ibid.*, II. 28.

[18] Indicated by the phrase "recuperatus per iuream", Stapleton, *Magni Rotuli, passim*.

[19] Notably in the cartulary of Fécamp (Valin, *Le Duc de Normandie*, p. 269; Round, *Calendar of Documents preserved in France*, no. 137; Delisle, no. 213), where there is a reference to the rights of the duke as recognized and recorded in his roll; and in the Bayeux cartularies (*Livre Noir*, no. 46; *Livre Rouge*, no. 46), where the phrase "recognitum autem fuit" shows that an extract has been made from a more comprehensive document. Being subsequent to the accession

full returns for the *vicomté* of the Avranchin,[21] which give us an exact picture of the king's rights and his administration in this district. Perhaps we may connect with the same inquest a still more important document of Henry's reign, the so-called *iurea regalis*, preserved in the *Très Ancien Coutumier*[22] and containing a statement of the duke's reserved jurisdiction and his rights over wardship, *craspice*, wreck, and treasure trove. Ducal example, if not ducal precept, is doubtless responsible for the exact surveys of the possessions of religious houses which were made in this reign and of which the chief Norman instance is the detailed inquest on the manors of La Trinité de Caen.[23] The military inquest of 1172[24] was a natural consequence of the English inquiry of 1166, itself perhaps suggested by Sicilian precedents,[25] but, save in the case of the Bishop

of Bishop Henry in 1165, the Bayeux document is not a part of the earlier inquests for this district nor connected with the general inquest of 1163, and the mention of William Fitz John seems to place it before the close of 1172 (see, on the date of his death, Delisle, p. 480, where it should be observed that the entry of 1180 refers to an old account). The portion of the original inquest which concerned the king would naturally be omitted in drawing up a statement for the benefit of the bishop.

[20] Preserved in the archives of the Seine-Inférieure; see Prévost, *Étude sur la Forêt de Roumare* (Rouen, 1904), pp. 354–365. The numerous references to Henry in the *Coutumier* which appeared to Beaurepaire (*Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, LXVII. 508) to point to a general inquest on the forests, seem rather to cite his charters.

[21] Printed by Delisle, pp. 345–347. *Cf.* Powicke, in *English Historical Review*, XXV. 710 f.; and for the date, Haskins, *ibid.*, XXVI. 326–328.

[22] Tardif, pp. 59–65. The *iurea* cannot be later than the death of William Patric in 1174, and it is anterior to 1172 if we accept Warner's date for the death of William Fitz John (*supra*, note 19); but there is nothing to connect it with any one year, and it may belong with the inquest of 1163 or with the earlier inquiries in the Bessin. In any case, in spite of its general form, it was the result of a local inquest, for all the jurors are in some way connected with the Bessin and the statement concerning the fishing rights of the Bishop of Bayeux and the Earl of Chester points to the same region. That William Fitz John was connected with earlier inquests in the Bessin (note 74) is pointed out by Tardif (*Étude sur les Sources*, p. 12), who, however, knows nothing of the inquest of 1171, in which year William was also justiciar (Round, no. 456; *Mémoires des Antiquaires de Normandie*, XV. 198).

[23] MS. Lat. 5650, ff. 60 v.–87, where the mention of William de Hummet (f. 82) shows that the inquests belong to the latter part of this reign and not to the earlier half of the century, as suggested by Legras, *Le Bourgage de Caen*, p. 37, note. The whole is to be published by R. N. Sauvage in the *Bibliothèque de Droit Normand*. English examples of monastic inquests in this period are those of the *Ramsey Cartulary*, III. 224–314; the inquest of 1181 in the *Domesday of St. Paul's*; and the Glastonbury inquisition of 1189.

[24] *Historiens de France*, XXIII. 693–699; *Red Book of the Exchequer*, pp. 624–647. On the text see Powicke, in *English Historical Review*, XXVI. 89–93; on the importance of the document for the history of the Norman baronage, see his *Loss of Normandy*, pp. 482–520.

[25] See my discussion in the *English Historical Review*, XXVI. 661–664.

of Bayeux[26] and the Abbot of Mont St. Michel,[27] we have only the general summary and not, as in the parallel English case, the original returns made by the tenants.

It would be especially interesting to know in some detail the history of Henry's early years as duke, not only because of their importance in forming the youth who was at twenty-one to become ruler of the vast Angevin empire, but also because we might then study the institutions of the duchy and the policy of its ruler before the union with England reopened the way to possible modification from without. Unfortunately the forty charters which constitute our sole source for the period from 1150 to 1154 give few answers to the many questions we should like to put. So far as they tell us anything, they show the young duke surrounded by his father's advisers and maintaining his father's policy, itself a continuation of the system of Henry I.,[28] but we can also discern certain new names which are to rise to importance in the ensuing period. Reginald of St. Valéry is still seneschal,[29] and so are Robert de Courcy, Robert de Neufbourg,[30] and Richard de la Haie;[31] but Manasses Bisset and Humphrey de Bohun also appear with this title,[32] while William the Marshal, Richard de Hummet the Constable,[33] and Warin Fitz Gerald the Chamberlain[34] are new. Beside Richard de Bohun, who

[26] *Mémoires des Antiquaires*, VIII. 425–431; *Historiens de France*, XXIII. 699–702. These returns were based on the inquest of 1133 and represent still earlier conditions, *English Historical Review*, XXII. 643 f.

[27] Robert of Torigni, II. 296–303; *Historiens de France*, XXIII. 703–705.

[28] *English Historical Review*, XXVII. 436–444. The following writ for Heauville, a priory of Marmoutier, is, save for the witnesses and the insertion of *avi mei*, an exact repetition of a writ of Geoffrey for the same establishment: "H. dux Normannorum et comes Andegavensium episcopo Constantinensi et iusticiis et vicecomitibus et baronibus Constantini salutem. Precipio et volo quod monachi sancti Martini Maiorismonasterii de Heauvilla teneant omnes terras et ecclesias et decimas et omnes res suas que pertinent ad elemosinam meam de Heauvilla ita bene et in pace et honorifice et iuste et quiete sicut melius et quietius tenuerunt tempore regis H. avi mei. Et nemo eis vel rebus eorum ullam iniuriam vel contumeliam faciat. Testibus Wilelmo de Angervilla et Hugone de Longo Campo apud Argentomum." Bibliothèque Nationale, Collection de Touraine, XXXI. 57, no. 7 (no. 8 is the writ of Geoffrey); not in Delisle.

[29] See the list of witnesses to Henry's early charters in Delisle, pp. 133 f., where, however, the official titles are not always given and no distinction is made between Normandy and Anjou.

[30] Robert de Neufbourg is not called seneschal in documents before 1155, but his activity as justice and his precedence in charters make it probable that he held this dignity also under Geoffrey and during the early years of Henry. See *English Historical Review*, XXVII. 437.

[31] *Ibid.*; *Livre Noir*, no. 7.

[32] *Livre Noir*, nos. 13, 138; *cf.* Vernon Harcourt, *His Grace the Steward*, p. 37.

[33] *Livre Noir*, nos. 13, 138; Round, no. 523. Humphrey Fitz Odo and William of Roumare also appear as constables, Delisle, pp. 127, 510, no. *40.

[34] *Livre Noir*, nos. 14, 40, 138.

continues to act as chancellor, we find another chancellor, William,[35] and a chancellor's clerk and keeper of the seal, Maurice,[36] who need clearing up. The most notable among these new men is the clever and ambitious Bishop Arnulf of Lisieux, who heads the lists of witnesses to Henry's charters and the list of justices in his *curia*,[37] thus restoring the office of justiciar which his predecessor Bishop John had held under Henry I. and which had disappeared under Geoffrey. Of humbler servants we find Odo *hostiarius*, doubtless the usher of this name who appears in the Pipe Rolls and perhaps the Odo of Falaise, *regiorum computator redituum*, who was cured of blindness at the tomb of Becket.[38] The *curia* meets in different parts of Normandy[39]—Rouen, Lisieux, Domfront—and has its share of judicial business: there the Abbot of Aunay proved his right to the church of Cenilly, the Abbot of Fécamp to his tithes in the neighboring forest, the Abbot of Savigny to the land claimed by Robert Fitz Ralph.[40] We get glimpses of a body of justices busy with the holding of sworn inquests and the protection of legal rights;[41] and there are local *vicomtes* and *baillis* and porters, all receiving their orders in the sharp, crisp language of the Anglo-Norman writ.[42]

So far as the sources of information are concerned, the period from 1154 to 1189 is divided into two almost equal parts by the change of the king's style in 1172–1173, which separates his charters into two groups, according as they do or do not contain the words *Dei gratia* in the title.[43] These groups do not differ notably in number, but the materials for the second half of the reign are the fuller, since the charters are there re-enforced by the Exchequer Rolls and by a larger number of records of judicial decisions. The earlier period is, however, the more interesting from a constitutional

[35] Delisle, p. 88, note. I do not understand why Delisle dismisses the early chancellors with bare mention in a foot-note; certainly Henry's chancery does not begin its history in 1154.

[36] Round, nos. 820, 1058, 1407.

[37] See especially *Livre Noir*, nos. 7, 13, 138; *Cartulaire de S. Ymer*, no. 6. For the disappearance of the justiciarship under Geoffrey see *English Historical Review*, XXVII. 436.

[38] He witnesses a charter in the cartulary of Mortemer, p. 59 (Delisle, no. *36). For Odo of Falaise see *Materials for the History of Thomas Becket*, II. 185.

[39] Delisle, nos. *30, *63, *71; Robert of Torigni, I. 255, 259. *Cf.*, also, the large gathering at Bayeux in November, 1151, Delisle, p. 122.

[40] Delisle, nos. *30, *63, *71; Round, nos. 127, 523, 826.

[41] *Livre Noir*, nos. 7, 13, 14, 138; *Cartulaire de S. Ymer*, no. 6; Round, nos. 12, 127, 516, 523, 821.

[42] Delisle, nos. *16, *36, and p. 126; *Livre Noir*, no. 40; Round, nos. 109, 516, 1406.

[43] Delisle, pp. 12–38.

point of view as being a period of origins, and this is notably true of the years between 1154 and 1164, preliminary to the struggle with the Church and the great legislative measures of the reign in England but as yet little known as regards conditions on either side of the Channel. The possibility of Norman precedents, especially in matters of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and civil procedure, requires a careful sifting of all the information that has reached us from what seems to have been a formative period in Henry's policy.

Let us first consider the administration of justice. Of the judicial business that came before the duke himself in his *curia* we have only the slightest indications,[44] and these tell us next to nothing in the earlier years. Between 1154 and 1164 the king spent half his time in England, while the affairs of his other dominions claimed many of the busy months he passed on the Continent. If Normandy was to have an effective judicial system, it must be organized to work in the king's long absences as well as under his immediate supervision. From his father and grandfather Henry inherited the institution of a regular body of justices, both in the *curia* and in local affairs, which he had only to develop and adapt to the needs of a rapidly expanding ducal jurisdiction. In this process there was doubtless constant experimentation, both with men and with methods, such as we can follow somewhat more closely in England later in the reign; but for the earlier years the Norman evidence happens to be fully as abundant as the English,[45] and shows us some features of the system with reasonable clearness.

First of all there is a distinction between the ordinary justices and the justiciar of Normandy, *iusticia mea Normannie*.[46] Ordinarily, as under Henry I.,[47] there would seem to have been two justiciars, a bishop and the chief seneschal, who frequently sit together, but at least five persons are known to have acted in this capacity in this period, and the available sources do not enable us to fix their succession and relation to one another with the precision which has sometimes been sought.[48] As under Geoffrey,[49] the courts

[44] *Mémoires des Antiquaires*, XV. 198; Delisle, p. 43; *infra*, note 56.

[45] For which see Stubbs, introduction to Benedict of Peterborough, II. lxiv.

[46] Notably in the clause of the king's writs, "nisi feceris iusticia mea Normannie faciat fieri", Round, nos. 44, 205, 492, 949; *Livre Noir*, nos. 12, 36 (*cf.* no. 37, of Henry I.). In other writs we find in the same clause only *iusticia mea*, Round, nos. 544, 882; *Livre Noir*, nos. 9, 10, 35. The substitution of a justice's name (*e. g.*, Round, nos. 127, 516, 523; *Livre Noir*, nos. 27, 28), accordingly, does not show that he was one of the chief justiciars.

[47] *English Historical Review*, XXIV. 218.

[48] Notably by Vernon Harcourt, *His Grace the Steward*, pp. 43–50. His attempt to sustain his theory of the unimportance of the seneschal by explaining away the dapifership of Robert de Neufbourg has been satisfactorily disposed of

held by the justiciars are called assizes,[50] often, by way of distinction from the lesser courts, full assizes (*plena assisia*);[51] and if we may judge from a full assize held at Caen in 1157 and attended by the barons from the four great regions of the west,[52] they comprehended several administrative districts. Meetings at Caen and Rouen are frequent, but not sufficiently regular to indicate the existence of a permanent central *curia*, and the justiciars are clearly itinerant. The lack of any rolls prevents our tracing their circuits, but the records of cases are more numerous than those which have been collected for England in the same period.[53] In 1155, before the king had returned from his coronation, Bishop Arnulf of Lisieux and Robert of Neufbourg the chief seneschal, as master justices of all Normandy, hold assizes at Carentan and Domfront.[54] In 1157 they appear in two judgments of the *curia* at Caen,[55] and about the same time in another proceeding, likewise at Caen, in part of which the Bishop of Lisieux is in his absence replaced by two barons.[56]

by Valin, *Le Duc de Normandie*, pp. 157–158. The charter of Henry II. for Savigny (Round, no. 824), in which Harcourt considers Robert's style "unofficial embellishment", is also in the Cartulaire de Normandie, f. 80 v. *Cf.* Delisle, p. 279.

49 "In assisia mea apud Valonias", American Historical Review, VIII. 630.

50 Robert of Torigni, II. 241; *Mémoires des Antiquaires*, XV.197. See Henry's writ in *Livre Noir*, no. 10, given "quando fui apud Baiocas ad assisiam meam", and directing William Patric to be "ad primam assisam que erit citra Lexovios" (anterior to 1172–1173, Delisle, no. 211).

51 "In plena assisia apud Abrincas", Deville, *Analyse d'un Ancien Cartulaire de S. Étienne*, p. 18; Valin, p. 268. "In plena assisia apud Rothomagum", cartulary of Préaux, no. 18; cartulary of St. Evroul, no. 172. "In plena assisia apud Argentomum", *ibid.*, no. 250 (1190).

52 "In plenaria curia regis, utpote in assisa ubi erant barones iiii comitatuum", Robert of Torigni, II. 251.

53 On conditions in England, see Pollock and Maitland, I. 156.

54 Robert of Torigni, II. 241.

55 *Ibid.*, II. 251; *Mémoires des Antiquaires*, XV. 197 (original in Archives of the Orne, H. 3912).

56 "Robertus de Novoburgo sinescallus Normannie archiepiscopo Rothomagensi et episcopis Normannie et consulibus et baronibus et omnibus fidelibus Henrici regis Anglie salutem. Notum vobis fieri volumus quod Robertus filius Radulfi de Thaun Cadomo in curia regis coram me qui eram iusticia Normannie et coram baronibus regis Ricardo abbati et monachis Savigneii reddidit in pace ac dimisit et in manu abbatis posuit decimas terre eorum de Thaun et quatuor acras terre quas ipse Robertus et fratres eius adversus abbatem et monachos antea calumniabantur et quas ipse abbas et monachi disrationaverunt in curia regis et coram ipso ad Danfront et de chatallis suis misit se in miseratione abbatis et monachorum pro malefactis que ipse et fratres eius fecerant eis. Et pepigit legitime quod faceret si posset fratres suos facere et tenere eundem finem cum abbate et monachis quem ipse faciebat, et si non posset quod legitime se teneret cum abbate et monachis contra fratres, et affidavit in manu mea et iuravit super sancta quod ipse hec omnia que hic diximus legitime teneret et conservaret abbati et monachis. Et hoc ipsum affidavit Vitalis de sancto Germano et Ricardus de Babainvilla et alii amici eius quos abbas voluit. Huius finis et pacis inter

Before his death in 1159 we find Robert de Neufbourg in various other cases at Avranches, Bayeux, Caen, and Rouen.[57] In 1157 there appears with him at Rouen Rotrou, bishop of Evreux,[58] who is active in the administration of justice throughout the duchy during the next seven years.[59] At times Rotrou is accompanied by Regi-

Robertum et abbatem et monachos fuerunt testes Godart de Vaus et Robertus de sancta Honorina qui erant in loco episcopi Luxoviarum et Willelmus filius Iohannis et Aitart Polcin qui erant baillivi regis et Robertus abbas Fontaneti et Ricardus filius comitis Gloecestrie et Iordanus Taisson et Rualen de Sal et Iohannes de Guavrei et Willelmus de Vilers et Gaufredus filius Mabile et Robertus filius Bernardi et Rannulfus Rufellus et Nicholaus de Veieves et Robertus de Chernellia et multi alii." Cartulary of Savigny, in Archives of the Manche, no. 219. "Ernulfus Dei gratia Luxoviensis episcopus et R. de Novoburgo Willelmo filio Iohannis salutem. Mandamus tibi atque precipimus ut facias amicos Roberti de Thaun quos abbas Savignecii tibi nominaverit facere fiduciam eidem abbati et monachis ipsius quam ipse Robertus fecit Cadomi coram nobis, et ut facias fratres Roberti forisbanniri in communi foro Cadomi et Baiocis sicut forisfactos regis." *Ibid.*, no. 273.

[57] *Livre Noir*, nos. 27, 28, 35; Valin, p. 267 f.; *Mémoires des Antiquaires*, XV. 198; Deville, *Analyse*, pp. 18, 42; cartulary of Préaux, nos. 78, 82. He is still "dapifer et iusticia totius Normannie" when he retires to Bec in 1159, Robert of Torigni, I. 322, II. 174. *Cf.* Delisle, pp. 445–447; Harcourt, p. 46 f.

[58] "In presencia domini Rotroldi episcopi Ebroicensis et Roberti de Novo Burgo dapiferi et Gualeranni comitis de Mellent et Rogerii abbatis Sancti Wandregisili et Rogerii abbatis Sancti Audoeni Rothomagensis et Hugonis de Gornaio et Godardi de Vallibus et Adam de Wacnevilla et Roberti filii Haimerici apud Rothomagum. Huius pactionis sunt testes". Cartulary of St. Wandrille, D. ii. 14. The first set of witnesses is different in the other version which follows in the cartulary and is printed by Lot, *Études Critiques sur l'Abbaye de S. Wandrille*, no. 88; Round, no. 172.

[59] Delisle, p. 455 f.; Valin, pp. 268, 270; *infra*, note 93. A document of Rotrou for Foucarmont (originals in Archives of the Seine-Inférieure; also in MS. Rouen 1224, f. 87) ends: "Hoc autem totum factum est me presente et audiente et tunc temporis existente iusticia Normannie." The following, for Conches, is more explicit: "Rotrodus Dei gratia Ebroisensis episcopus universis sancte matris ecclesie filiis salutem. Notificamus vobis quod Gilbertus Sancti Petri Castellionensis abbas stramen grangie de Warengevilla et palleas cum revaneis iudicio curie domini regis obtinuit contra Mathilde[m] de Monasteris et contra Matheum filium eius disracionavit, quoniam monachos prefate ecclesie inde mul^{t}um diu placitis et altercationibus indiscussis vexaverant. Hoc autem iudicium factum est apud Rothomagum in monasterio sancti Gervacii me presente Reinnoldo de sancto Walerico iusticia in curia existente plenissima plurimorum virorum qui huius rei testes fuerunt: Arnulphus Luxoviensis episcopus, Frogerius Sagiensis episcopus, Henricus abbas Fiscannensis, Hugo de Gurnaio, Godardus de Vallibus, Robertus de Freschenes, Adam de Martinevilla, Goselinus Rossel, Robertus Harenc de Waldevilla, Rogerius Mahiel, et alii multi." Cartulary in Archives of the Eure, H. 262, f. 101 v.; filled out from Delisle's copy from a MS. relating to the family of Chambray. Still another example is in the cartulary of Préaux (no. 18): "Notum sit tam presentibus quam futuris quoniam cum ego R. episcopus Ebroicensis et Ricardus de Hummeto constabularius regis essemus iusticiarii regis, Galfredus de Bruecourt et Gislebertus de Bruencourt et Robertus filius Matildis in presentia nostra in plena assisia apud Rothomagum clamaverunt quietam imperpetuum presentationem ecclesie de Bruencourt Michaeli

nald of St. Valéry as justiciar,[60] and in 1163 they hold an itinerary throughout the duchy to ascertain the respective rights of king and barons.[61] Richard de Hommet the constable also appears with this title,[62] and the Bishop of Bayeux may also have held it.[63]

These courts were doubtless attended by the chief barons and royal officers of the region,[64] some of whom evidently acted as judges, although the title of justice appears rarely in the notices of decisions and in most instances it is impossible to distinguish the officials from the barons. A good example is furnished by an assize held at Bayeux by the Bishop of Evreux and Reginald of St. Valéry between 1161 and 1165, where we find the bishops of Lisieux and Avranches, Richard son of the Earl of Gloucester, Godard de Vaux, one of the king's justices,[65] Étard Poulain, one of his *baillis* in the Bessin,[66] Osbert de la Heuse, constable of Cherbourg,[67] Robert Fitz Bernard, *prévôt* of Caen,[68] Graverend d'Evrecy, *vicomte*,[69] Richard de Vaux, *vidame* of the Bishop of Bayeux,[70] and Roger d'Arri, canon of Bayeux and later a permanent official of the Exchequer.[71] The

abbati et ecclesie Pratellensi de qua diu controversia inter eos fuerat. Testibus Hugo [*sic*] de Gornaio et Matheo de Gerardivilla et Nicholaus [*sic*] de Stutevilla et G. de Vallibus et Roberto de Passi et Gisleberto de Vascoil et Roberto de Iuveneio."

[60] Delisle, p. 455; Valin, p. 270; Round, nos. 133, 134, 491; Harcourt, p. 48 f.; and the charters printed in the previous note and in note 79 below. Reginald was absent in the East from 1158 to 1160, Robert of Torigni, I. 316, II. 166.

[61] "Rotrocus episcopus Ebroicensis et Rainaldus de sancto Walerio fecerunt in Normannia recognoscere iussu regis, per episcopatus, legales redditus et consuetudines ad regem et ad barones pertinentes", Robert of Torigni, I. 344.

[62] A judgment of 1164 is rendered "apud Cadomum [coram] abbate de Troarno, Ricardo de Humet tunc temporis iustitia regis, Guillelmo filio Iohannis, Renaldo de Gerponville, Godardo de Vaux, Guillelmo de Varaville, Iordane Taxone, Ricardo filio comitis, Guillelmo Crasso, Henrico de Agnis, Nicholao de Veies, Graver[endo] de Vrecie, Roberto filio Bernardi, Symone de Scuris, Henrico filio Corbini, Roberto Pigache, Guillelmo Forti, Philippo fratre Vitalis monachi, Guillelmo Gernon, Rogero Darried, Ricardo de Vaux, Iohanne Cumin" Cartulary of S. Wandrille, Q. ii. 36. See also *supra*, note 59.

[63] He is specially mentioned with Robert de Neufbourg in Round, no. 132, and with Rotrou in Valin, p. 268. *Cf.* Harcourt, p. 47, note.

[64] "Interfuerunt huic concordie comes de Mellent, comes Ebroicensis, comes Giffardus, et multi barones et servientes regis de diversis partibus." Charter of Rotrou, Delisle, p. 455.

[65] Valin, p. 270; *Mémoires des Antiquaires*, XV. 197. *Cf.* the longer list in the assize at Caen in 1164, *supra*, note 62.

[66] *Infra*, notes 77–79.

[67] Delisle, p. 409.

[68] Robert of Torigni, II. 251.

[69] *Ibid.*, II. 248.

[70] *Ibid.*, II. 258.

[71] See lists of Exchequer cases and of assizes in part II. of this article to be published in the January number of this journal.

vicomtes and *baillis* acted as judges in their own districts,[72] where an ordinance of 1159 required them to hold court once a month,[73] and they naturally sat with the justiciars in the larger assizes, where they are sometimes specifically called justices. Thus William Fitz John and Étard Poulain, the chief royal officers in the Bessin,[74] both with the title of *baillivi regis*,[75] are constantly found in the assizes of Lower Normandy. William can be traced in the local administration of justice as well as in the assizes, and later in the reign becomes *dapifer*, justice, and *procurator Normannie*.[76] Étard sits in two cases at Caen in 1157, in one of them apparently with the title of justiciar,[77] and is *iusticia regis* at Lisieux in 1161[78] and at Rouen in the same period.[79] He is frequently accompanied by Godard de Vaux, who replaces the Bishop of Lisieux at Caen at the beginning of the reign, sits at Caen and Rouen in 1157,[80] and appears at various other sessions at Rouen in this period, often with a certain Adam de Warneville, who may also have been a justice.[81] Our

[72] Thus at Pontaudemer and in the territory of Brionne, William de Morville is "custos et iusticia iussu regis Henrici", cartulary of Pontaudemer (MS. Rouen 1252), ff. 18, 28; Delisle, no. 240. At Mortain in 1162–1163 we find the constable, Robert Boquerel (*Analecta Bollandiana*, II. 527), holding the king's court (Delisle, p. 440; original in MS. Rouen 3122, no. 4); and somewhat later the seneschal of Mortain, Nigel, addressed as one of the king's justices (Stapleton, I. lxv; Delisle, pp. 210, 408).

[73] Robert of Torigni, II. 180.

[74] Delisle, pp. 366, 479 f.; Tardif, I. 110; *Livre Noir*, nos. 9, 12.

[75] Delisle, p. 446; *supra*, note 56.

[76] *Livre Noir*, nos. 27, 28, 35, 36, 46; Robert of Torigni, II. 31, 251 f.; Round, no. 516; *Mémoires des Antiquaires*, XV. 198; *supra*, notes 56, 62.

[77] Robert of Torigni, II. 252; *Mémoires des Antiquaires*, XV. 197.

[78] *Infra*, note 105.

[79] "Gaufridus Rothomagensis ecclesie decanus et tocius eiusdem ecclesie conventus presentibus et futuris salutem. [Not]um esse volumus sancte mātris ecclesie filiis quod m[olendinu]m nostrum de Marrona concedimus domui infirmorum de Rothomago [in ec]clesia Sancti Iacobi tenendum in perpetuum sicut tenuerunt iure hereditario Macharius et heredes eius a quibus ipsum emerunt pro .xv. marcis argenti, salvo ibi censu nostro scilicet tribus solidis usualis monete singulis annis in festo Sancti Remigii reddendis. Hec autem em[ptio publice] celebrata est in presentia nostra cui interfuerunt etiam [iustitie regis] Rainaldus de Sancto Walerico, Godardus de Vallibus, [Adam de W]annevilla, Willelmus de Malapalude, Radulfus filius Urselini, Ro[celin filius] Clarembaldi, Rainaldus de Sancto Philiberto." Original, injured but with missing portions supplied in modern copy, in Archives Nationales, S. 4899, no. 6. Delisle by a slip attributes this document to Geoffrey's successor Robert and thus places it after 1175, the date of Geoffrey's death; the error vitiates several of his biographical notes (pp. 100, 377, 417, 422, 449, 491). William de Malpalu also appears as justice in Delisle, p. 490; and in a document of Richard Talbot for Mont-aux-Malades (Archives of the Seine-Inférieure), where an agreement is sworn to "coram Willelmo de Mala Palude tunc regis iusticiario".

[80] *Supra*, notes 56, 58.

[81] *Supra*, notes 58, 59; *infra*, note 93; Delisle, p. 456; cartulary of Préaux, nos. 78, 82; also, perhaps, as justice, in an illegible charter in the Archives of the Manche, H. 212.

information does not permit us to separate the local from the itinerant judges in the records of the assizes, still less to follow the work of the local courts. Doubtless arrangements varied locally and in the course of the reign, and apparently the confusion of local areas stood in the way of a system of courts as simple and uniform as the English. The one clear point of special importance is the existence of a well-defined institution of itinerant justices.

Of even greater interest is the question of procedure, which bears directly upon the development of the jury. In England, in spite of the occasional employment of the sworn inquest since the Conqueror's time, we have no evidence that it was a normal mode of trial before the appearance of the assize *utrum* in 1164, followed shortly by the other possessory assizes and the grand assize. In Normandy, on the other hand, writs ordering the determination of questions of possession and ownership in accordance with the duke's assize (*secundum assisiam meam*) are found in the early part of Geoffrey's reign and again in 1156,[82] and it has been argued that these point to the establishment of the recognition as a regular method of trial throughout the duchy by a formal enactment or assize in this period.[83] Unfortunately we find the phrase in these early years only in documents in favor of the see of Bayeux, and while the bishop clearly had the right of having any dispute between him and his tenants determined in this way, it is not clear that the privilege had thus early become general. Early in Henry's reign (1156–1159), however, we have a striking piece of evidence regarding its wider use. In the course of a series of inquests held in different parts of Normandy for the benefit of St. Stephen's of Caen we read that it was recognized at Rouen that "the monks should hold quit their meadows of Bapeaume, with respect to which William, son of Thétion de Fonte, who claimed the right to them, failed as regards the title and the decision of right before Robert and the barons of Normandy in the king's *curia* and as regards the assize which he had demanded with respect to them".[84] The ac-

[82] *Livre Noir*, nos. 24, 25, 27.

[83] Brunner, *Entstehung der Schwurgerichte*, pp. 301–304; Valin, *Le Duc de Normandie*, pp. 208–210, both of whom wrongly attribute nos. 24 and 25 to Henry as duke instead of to Geoffrey. I have discussed the Bayeux evidence in the AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, VIII. 613–640 (1903). The discovery of the word assize in the recognition for St. Stephen's in the Cartulaire de Normandie has since led me to give more weight to the possibility of a general assize under Geoffrey than I was then inclined to admit.

[84] "Et recognitum fuit quod predictis monachis remanserunt sua prata de Abapalmis quieta unde Willelmus filius Thetionis de Fonte, qui in illis clamabat ius, defecit se de iure et de consideratione recti coram Roberto et coram baronibus Normannie in curia regis et de assisia quam inde requisierat." Charter of

count is brief, all too brief, for we have only the summary of the case in a royal charter of confirmation, but two points stand out clearly: the question at issue was that of right to the land (*ius*), and not mere possession;[85] and the party which demanded the assize in the king's court was the lay claimant, not the monastery, as in the other recognitions for St. Stephen's. The assize in this instance, therefore, cannot be a special privilege enjoyed by an ecclesiastical establishment, since it is demanded against the monks, nor could such a claimant have put himself upon the assize unless this was a regular method of trial, such as the term comes to denote in England. All this, be it noted, cannot be later than 1159, when Robert de Neufbourg retired from his judicial functions, and thus antedates considerably the first mention of such assizes in England.[86] In this same year, at his Christmas court at Falaise,[87] Henry decreed that the testimony of the vicinage should be required in support of charges brought by rural deans, and that his own officers, in the monthly decisions of the local courts, should "pronounce no judgments without the evidence of neighbors". The exact meaning of this comprehensive language does not appear from our only source of information, the Bec annalist, but it seems not only to require such use of the accusing jury in ecclesiastical courts as is prescribed in the Constitutions of Clarendon,[88] but also to give it wider scope in the ducal courts, very likely by extending it to criminal accusations before the duke's local judges. Already the itinerant justices are having outlaws proclaimed in the marketplaces,[89] and felons are soon fleeing the realm for their crimes.[90] If we could accept the evidence of a charter of Henry for St. Evroul, apparently given between 1159 and 1163,[91] the existence of a form of recognition cor-

Henry II. in Cartulaire de Normandie (MS. Rouen 1235), f. 21 v., printed in Valin, p. 268, where it is loosely dated; Delisle, no. 110. No. 74 in Delisle probably covers the same decisions.

[85] I cannot follow Valin, p. 213, in interpreting the suit as one concerning possession.

[86] The assizes cited by Bigelow, *History of Procedure*, p. 124, from the early Pipe Rolls denote evidently the *assisa comitatus*. Not till 1166 do these rolls use the term in the sense of royal legislation.

[87] Robert of Torigni, II. 180. *Cf.* Pollock and Maitland, I. 151. Stubbs says (Benedictus, II. lix): "This looks very like an instruction to the county court."

[88] C. 6.

[89] *Supra*, note 56. On the importance of the *fora patrie* in such cases see the *Très Ancien Coutumier*, cc. 36, 37; and *cf.* Wace, *Roman du Rou* (ed. Andresen), vol. II., l. 334; and Arnulf of Lisieux, *Epistolae*, no. 110.

[90] Round, no. 133.

[91] Printed by me, from an incorrect copy from the cartulary of St. Evroul, no. 24, in the AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, VIII. 634. Also in the Registres du Trésor des Chartes, JJ. 69, no. 194; Round, no. 641; Delisle, no. 141.

responding to the assize *utrum* would be established for Normandy in this period. This document, however, which is suspicious in form,[92] does not correspond to the report of the case by the justiciar Rotrou,[93] and I believe it to contain a somewhat modernized version of the transaction, prepared in the later years of the twelfth century. Rotrou's charter says nothing of the question of lay fee or alms, but adjudges to the monks, after sworn inquest, full right to the presentation, tithes, and lands belonging to the church in question.

[92] The charter combines the king's style of the latter half of the reign with a witness who cannot be later than 1163, and contains the suspicious phrase *teste me ipso*, which appears in two other fabrications of this period from St. Evroul (Delisle, nos. 347, 362; see pp. 226, 316 f.) and has not yet been found in an original charter of this reign (Delisle, p. 226, where he makes too much of the occurrence of the phrase in charters for different monasteries, since copyists or forgers might easily carry back a formula common in the succeeding reign). The language of the document is also unusual, quite unlike that of Rotrou's charter, which speaks of but five knights and reports the determination of more limited questions of title. As Henry's charter is also found in a *vidimus* of Mathilda, daughter of the monastery's adversary in the suit (cartulary of St Evroul, no. 426; Collection Lenoir, at Semilly, LXXII. 17, LXXIII. 467), its fabrication or modification cannot be placed more than a generation later.

[93] "Rotrodus Dei gratia Rothomagensis archiepiscopus omnibus ad quos presens scriptum pervenerit et precipue ballivis domini regis salutem. Sciatis quod ex precepto domini regis quando per eum per totam Normanniam iusticiam secularem exercebamus, miseratione divina tunc temporis Ebroicensem episcopatum regentes, in plena assisia apud Rothomagum die festo sancte Cecilie Garinus de Grandivalle et Ricardus Faiel et Rogerus de Moenaio et Rogerus Goulafre et Robertus Chevalier iuraverunt quod ecclesia sancti Ebrulfi et abbas et monachi eius anno et die quo H. rex filius Willelmi regis fuit vivus et mortuus et postea usque modo presentationem beati Petri de Sap pacifice et quiete habuit in elemosinam cum omnibus decimis et aliis pertinenciis suis et masnagium Willelmi filii Hugonis cum omnibus pertinenciis suis tam in terris quam in aliis rebus possedit. Ipsi vero milites se fecerunt ignorantes utrum cultura que Ardeneta noncupatur ad ius sancti Ebrulfi vel ad ius domini de Sap verius pertineret, et tamen quandam acram terre in eadem cultura per ecclesiam sancti Ebrulfi cultam fuisse per sacramentum se vidisse testati sunt. Post obitum vero predicti H. regis residuum predicte culture per abbatem sancti Ebrulfi cultum fuisse prefati milites necnon et totam illam culturam ad abbatiam sancti Ebrulfi pocius quam ad dominum de Sappo secundum oppinionem suam pertinere iuraverunt. Nos autem domini regis adimplentes mandatum de consilio baronum ipsius qui presentes erant presentationem predicte ecclesie cum decimis et aliis pertinenciis suis necnon et masnagium iam dictum cum cultura de Ardeneta et aliis omnibus, que sicut dictum est secundum formam regii mandati abbati et monachis eius recognita fuerunt, eisdem de cetero in pace et quiete habenda et possidenda, licet nunquam amisissent, adiudicavimus.

"Testibus Arnulfo Lexoviensi episcopo, H[enrico] abbati Fiscannensi, Victore abbate sancti Georgii de Bauchervilla, Galeranno comite Mellenti, comite Patricio, camerario de Tancarvilla, Hugone de Gornaco, Roberto filio Geroii, Nicholao de Stotevilla, Godardo de Vallibus, Roberto filio Hamerici, Roberto de Varvic, Raginaldo de Ierponvilla, Ricardo Beverel, Adam de Walnevilla." MS. Lat. 11055, no. 172.

Besides these traces of legislation, we find in the early years of Henry's reign, numerous instances of recognitions held to ascertain the rights of the duke[94] and the feudal and domanial possessions of churches and monasteries,[95] as well as examples of sworn inquests in bishops' and barons' courts[96] and by voluntary agreement between claimants;[97] but these, while affording further illustration of the prevalence of this mode of trial, are not in themselves sufficient to show that it has become the normal form of procedure. Only when we get away from the inquest which is primarily fiscal, whether for the benefit of the king or of some privileged church, and find the recognition regularly resorted to by ordinary litigants in particular categories of cases, can we be sure that we have something which corresponds to the later English assizes. Such evidence is afforded by the suit of William Fitz Thétion against St. Stephen's to determine the right to the meadows near Rouen, and by a case in the king's court at Gavray in 1159 in which Osmund Vasce proved his right to the presentation of Mesnil-Drey and two sheaves of its tithe.[98] These cases presuppose the recognition as the method of deciding such suits, and when considered in connection with the enactments at Falaise respecting the accusing jury, they seem to imply some specific act of legislation on the part of the duke, like the "constitutio regni que assisa nominatur" of Glanvill.[99] Such legislation may well have begun with general privileges for particular religious establishments, such as Geoffrey issued for the Bishop of Bayeux, but by 1159 it had gone so far as to set up the recognition in the local courts and had apparently made it the normal procedure in certain types of actions concerning land. That matters had then reached this point on the English side of the Channel has not up to the present been shown, and in the existing state of our knowledge it is highly probable that Henry drew upon the results of his Norman experience in

[94] *Livre Noir*, nos. 13, 35, 138; Robert of Torigni, I. 344; Musée de la Bénédictine de Fécamp, no. 16 (Round, no. 134; Delisle, no. 145); *supra*, notes 19–22.

[95] Valin, pp. 267–270; *Mémoires des Antiquaires*, XV. 197–198; Robert of Torigni, II. 241, 251.

[96] American Historical Review, VIII. 636–638; Valin, p. 264; charter of Fulc, dean of Lisieux, in 1148, Archives of the Calvados, fonds of Ste. Barbe; charter of Philip, bishop of Bayeux, in MS. Lat. 11055, no. 233; cartulary of Préaux, no. 93; charter of John, count of Eu, in cartulary of Foucarmont, f. 48 v., and two charters of Archbishop Hugh for Fécamp in the Archives of the Seine-Inférieure.

[97] American Historical Review, VIII. 636. Somewhat later examples will be found in the Great Cartulary of Jumièges, no. 212; cartulary of Fécamp (MS. Rouen, 1207), f. 36 v.; *Livre Blanc* of St. Martin of Séez, no. 269.

[98] Robert of Torigni, II. 259; see *infra*, note 103.

[99] XIII., c. I.

drafting his English assizes. There was, of course, no mechanical transfer, for a restless experimenter like Henry was constantly reshaping his materials, and if we could follow the process in Normandy, we should probably find him modifying in various ways the procedure and the assize which he had inherited from his father. Something, too, must be allowed for the natural development of the institution as it passed into more general use, but the exceptional is not likely to have become normal without some direct action of the sovereign in extending his prerogative procedure to his subjects, and in this respect the evidence available from the years before 1164 places Normandy in advance of England.

There is another field in which the practice of the Norman courts before 1164 has a special interest for England, namely that of ecclesiastical jurisdiction. The struggle between Henry II. and Becket, says Maitland, has a long Frankish prologue; has it also a Norman prologue? A short prologue, at least, it must have had, for in February, 1162, a great council was held at Rouen, in which Henry "complained of the bishops and their officers and his *vicomtes* and ordered that the provisions of the Council of Lillebonne should be observed".[100] No details are given, but the mention of the local officers and the Council of Lillebonne shows plainly that the question was one of encroachments by the Church which his officers failed to prevent. Just which of the canons of this council the king believed to have been violated we can only surmise, but he clearly sought to base his protest, as in England two years later, upon an appeal to ancient and well-established practice, as contained in a document which had been drawn up under the Conqueror in 1080 and confirmed by Henry I.,[101] and which thus presented a more definite formulation of the "customs, liberties, and dignities of his ancestors" than was at hand in England. From the ecclesiastical point of view, these canons had become somewhat antiquated by 1162, since they appealed constantly to local Norman usage rather than to

[100] "Querimoniam faciens de episcopis et eorum ministris et vicecomitibus suis, iussit ut concilium Iulie Bone teneretur." Robert of Torigni, I. 336.

[101] The best text of the Council of Lillebonne, now preserved in the Archives Nationales, bears the seal of Henry I. Teulet, *Layettes*, I. 25, no. 22; Delisle, *Cartulaire Normand*, no. 1. The canons are also given by Ordericus, II. 316–323; *cf.* the analysis given by Tardif, *Étude sur les Sources*, pp. 39–43. Evidence that they were observed in the twelfth century is found in a charter of Audoin, bishop of Evreux from 1118 to 1139: "Convocatis ex more ad synodum omnibus presbiteris nostris, circadam quam ab illis exigebam ex concilii Iulibone institutione et ecclesiarum episcopalium Normannie consuetudine, quoniam illa gravari conquerebantur, eorum communi petitione et nostrorum canonicorum intercessione perdonavi." Archives of the Eure, G. 122, no. 36. The canons of the council were frequently copied in legal collections relating to Normandy.

the general principles of canon law which had been more sharply formulated in the interval, and since they recognized the supremacy of the duke and the arbitrament of his *curia* in church matters to an extent which would not have been admitted by the Church in Henry's time. It is, indeed, highly probable that Henry's complaint was based particularly upon the closing enactment of the assembly of Lillebonne, that the bishops should seize no right of justice or customary dues beyond those there enumerated until they had established their claim in the king's court; but the absence of evidence precludes us from examining the bearing of this canon upon the vexed question of criminous clerks. The ordinance of 1159 to which reference has already been made[102] indicates that Henry's dissatisfaction with the exercise of jurisdiction by archdeacons and deans had found expression in Normandy as well as in England before the great struggle with Becket. Still another claim which Henry made in 1164 we are able to test by Norman practice, namely, the jurisdiction of the king's court over suits respecting advowson and presentation. That such questions were decided in the duke's court is clear from documents concerning Mont St. Michel and St. Evroul,[103] one of which deals with a dispute between laymen, the other between a layman and a monastery; but we also find the bishop exercising jurisdiction in such cases when one or both of the parties were ecclesiastics,[104] and it is not clear where the line was at this time drawn, if it was as yet clearly drawn, between the two jurisdictions.[105] Along with the question of presentation went often that of the tithe and the lands pertaining to the Church, and while we find traces of the bishop's jurisdiction here also,[106] we know that these questions were repeatedly tried in

[102] Robert of Torigni, II. 180; *supra*, p. 37.

[103] Robert of Torigni, II. 259; *supra*, note 93.

[104] Robert of Torigni, II. 259; dispute between Archbishop Hugh and the Abbot of Préaux, cartulary of Préaux, no. 51; Jourdain Taisson v. a clerk in the court of Henry, bishop of Bayeux, Archives of the Calvados, H. 5606, 3.

[105] Both jurisdictions might, apparently without rivalry, deal with the same case. Thus (1156–1159) we find the Prior of Perrières establishing his right to the tithe of Epanney in the courts of the Bishop of Séez (Collection Moreau, LXVIII. 9), the Archbishop of Rouen (Archives of the Orne, H. 2026), and the king, the judgment being finally confirmed by Henry: "teneat bene et in pace et quiete totam decimam suam de Espanaio sicut eam dirationavit in curia mea coram iusticiis meis et in curia archiepiscopi Rothomagensis" (Collection Moreau, LXVII. 150). We also find the king's justices sitting in the court of the Bishop of Lisieux in 1161 in a case between Alice Trubaud and the Abbot of Caen against the Abbot of Troarn: "Huius autem actionis sunt testes et ipsius iudicii cooperatores extiterunt Normannus et Iohannes archidiaconi, Fulco decanus, Rogerius filius Aini canonicus et alii plures canonici Lexovienses sed et barones regis Radulfus de Torneio, Robertus de Montfort, Aicardus Pulcin iusticia regis"; cartulary of Troarn (MS. Lat. 10086), f. 159; *cf.* Arnulf's charter, f. 152 v.

[106] *E. g.*, *Neustria Pia*, p. 351; cartulary of St. Evroul (MS. Lat. 11055), no. 233.

the duke's court by recognition,[107] which seems to have taken the form, not of the preliminary assize *utrum*, but of the ultimate adjudication of the lands to the claimant.[108] Here, as in all questions concerning the Norman antecedents of the Constitutions of Clarendon, the evidence is interesting but too scanty to be conclusive.

CHARLES H. HASKINS.

[107] *Supra*, notes 93, 98; Delisle, no. 268; Stapleton, l. 5, 12, 43, 55, 64, 96; Archives of the Manche, H. 6452; Archives of the Calvados, H. suppl. 486, f. 9.

[108] Brunner, *Schwurgerichte*, pp. 324–326; Maitland, *Collected Papers*, II. 216, who argues from the *Coutumier* that the Norman assize was merely preliminary.

COLONIAL COMMERCE[1]

As a rule trade and commerce in their various manifestations, as features of American colonial history, have been considered of minor importance by our historians and relegated to the obscurity of a few supplemental paragraphs. No writer has placed them in the same rank with government, administration, and social development, or has deemed their consideration essential to a proper understanding of the conditions under which our colonies were founded and grew up. Yet it is a well-recognized fact that during the greater part of our colonial period commerce and the colonies were correlative terms, unthinkable each without the other. As an underlying factor in colonial life commerce was of greater significance than it is to-day in the life of the United States, for some of the most vital aspects of our early history can be understood only when construed in terms of commercial relationship, either with England or with some of the other maritime powers of the period which were finding their strength and prosperity in colonial and commercial expansion.

In the domain of history a shift in the angle of observation will often bring into view new and important vistas and will create such new impressions of old scenes as to alter our ideas of the whole landscape. In the case of colonial history this statement is peculiarly true. Viewing the colonies as isolated units of government and life, detached in the main from the larger world of England and the Continent, leads us to ignore those connections that constituted the colonial relationship in which commerce played a most important rôle. The older view is natural because it is easily taken and satisfies local interest and pride; the newer point of observation is more remote, less obvious, and more difficult of attainment. Yet it is the only view that enables us to preserve the integrity of our subject and so to comprehend the meaning of our history. The thirteen colonies were not isolated units; they were dependencies of the British crown and parts of a colonial empire extending from America to India. They were not a detached group of communities; on the contrary they were a group among other groups of settlements and plantations belonging colonially to five of the European nations, Portugal, Spain, Holland, France, and England, and their history was influenced at

[1] A paper read in the conference on colonial commerce at the meeting of the American Historical Association in Charleston, December 30, 1913.

every point by the policies and rivalries of these maritime powers. The age in which they reached their maximum of strength as colonies was one in which the colonial relationship was highly developed and the feature of subordination to a higher authority an integral and dominant characteristic. Such an interpretation of colonial history is not a scholar's vagary, a matter of theory and hypothesis to be accepted or rejected as the writer on colonial history may please. It is historically sound, preserving the proper perspective, and preventing in no way the following out to the uttermost detail the local activities and interests of the colonists themselves.

The reason why this colonial relationship has been so persistently ignored in the past is not difficult to discover. The period of our history before 1783 has been construed as merely the ante-chamber to the great hall of our national development. In so doing writers have concerned themselves not with colonial history as such, but rather with the colonial antecedents of our national history. This form of treatment is common to all our histories, even the very best, because all limit their scope to the thirteen colonies, which formed but part of the colonial area and are segregated for no other reason than that they constituted the portion out of which the United States of America grew. In our text-books, not excepting the very latest, the colonial period is frankly presented as an era of beginnings, and stress is laid upon ideas and institutions that were destined to become dominant features of the nation's later career. With this mode of presenting the subject we may not quarrel, but it seems almost a pity, now that we are becoming such a nation of text-book writers, that the children of the country cannot be set upon the right way of understanding what the colonial period really means. Dealing with thirteen colonies, searching among them for the conditions under which were laid the foundations of the great republic, and treating those conditions as but preliminary to the history of the United States will never enable the writer to present an honest or complete picture of colonial life or to analyze successfully the causes that provoked revolution or rendered independence inevitable.

In one respect the colonial period is fundamentally different from that of our national history. For one hundred and seventy-five years, the people who inhabited the American seaboard were not members of an independent and sovereign state, free of all control except such as they exercised for themselves. Legally, they formed dependent and subordinate communities, subject to a will and authority higher than themselves and outside of themselves. This state of dependency was a reality and not a pretense. At least, the members

of the British Parliament deemed it so, when in 1733 they rejected a petition from the assembly of Massachusetts as "frivolous and groundless, an high insult upon his Majesty's government, and tending to shake off the dependency of the said colony upon this kingdom, to which by law and right they are and ought to be subject". At least the British executive and administrative authorities deemed it so, when by a thousand acts and through hundreds of officials in the colonies they endeavored to maintain the royal prerogative and to carry out the British policy of making English subjects the sole carriers of the whole British commerce and of appropriating and securing to England and her subjects "all the emoluments arising from the trade of her own colonies". The British merchants took this view, when they could say, as Stephen Godin asserted in 1724, that "it were better to have no colonies at all unless they be subservient to their mother country". Certainly the colonists deemed it so, when by their very restlessness under restraint they betrayed the reality of the ties that bound them. No act of the colonists, either individual or collective, can be traced to a conscious expectation of future citizenship in an independent republic. No aspect of colonial resistance to the royal authority was ever due to any definite belief that an independent nation was in the making. There is nothing to show that a colonist ever allowed visions of such a future to influence the course of his daily life. To the colonist there was no United States of America in anticipation, and there should be none to the student of colonial history to-day. The subject should be dealt with for its own sake and not for its manifestations of self-government and democracy; and the eye of the scholar should look no further ahead than to its legitimate end, the close of a period, the era of revolution, war, and independence.

It may be stated as a general principle that studying a period of history with its later manifestations before us is apt to lead to perversions of historical truth. With notions of the present in mind we approach certain landmarks of our early history in much the same spirit as that in which older writers approached Magna Carta. Most of us make too few allowances for the differences of mental longitude between the present and the past, and fail to realize that our thoughts were not the thoughts of our forefathers and our institutions were not the institutions they set up. The colonial period is our Middle Ages, and he would be rash who interpreted the thoughts of that time in the light of later views as to what democracy ought to be. There are traces and important traces of radical notions in matters of government in our colonial period, for our colonies were settled during a century of unrest in religion and politics; but these notions were not

the characteristic or the generally prevalent ideas that governed colonial action. It is not profitable or scholarly to single out these manifestations, to study them apart from their surroundings, and to classify them as representative and typical of the period in which they appeared. I am afraid that the majority of the colonists listening to some modern comments upon the early institutions of New England and Virginia, would have replied in somewhat the same fashion as Maitland pictures William Lyndwood replying to questions on the "canon law of Rome":

> I do not quite understand what you mean by popular liberties and this thing that you call democracy. I am an Englishman and I know the liberties that I enjoyed in England. But these were class liberties, to be understood in the light of the law and of the rights of the crown and parliament; they are not what you mean when you talk about popular rights and liberties in a democratic republic. You mean equal liberties for all, including the mass of the people. But that is something we do not want, for that would admit all men of whatever station, property, or faith to equal privileges in society, church, and state, and such a philosophy of government is one in which only a dreamer would believe.

In truth, we have arrived at this idea of what our forefathers thought, by selecting certain documents and incidents, from the Mayflower Compact to the Declaration of Independence, and from Bacon's Rebellion to the various riotous acts of the pre-Revolutionary period; and, construing them more or less according to our wishes and prepossessions, have wrought therefrom an epic of patriotism satisfying to our self-esteem. We love to praise those who struggled, sometimes with high purposes, sometimes under the influence of purely selfish motives, against the authority of the British crown. But this, in an historical sense, is pure pragmatism. It is not history, because it treats only a part of the subject and treats it wrongly and with a manifest bias. It does not deal with what may be called the normal conditions of the colonial period. It ignores the prevailing sentiment of those who, however often they may have objected to the way in which the royal authority was exercised and to the men who exercised it, lived contented lives, satisfied in the main with the conditions surrounding them, and believing firmly in the system of government under which they had been born and brought up. It misunderstands and consequently exaggerates expressions of radical sentiment, and interprets such terms as "freedom", "liberty", and "independence" as if, in the mouths of those who used them, they had but a single meaning and that meaning the one commonly prevalent at the present time. It relegates to a place of secondary importance the royal prerogative and the relation with England,

which beyond all other factors dominated the lives and actions of a majority of the colonists. Without an understanding of the relationship with England, colonial history can have no meaning. Before we can treat of colonial self-government, of the growth of democratic ideas, of the conflict between the colonies and the mother-country, and of the westward movement, we must know what England was doing, according to what principles she acted, and how these principles found application in the colonial world that stretched from Hudson Bay to Barbadoes. Only in this way can we deal with our own colonial problems, and only in this way can we answer those subordinate but important questions, why did not the West Indies and the Floridas revolt, and why did the Canadian colonies remain loyal to the mother-country.

This preliminary statement is necessary in order to explain the attitude that I shall take in regard to the subject under consideration here. One period of our history, that from 1690 to 1750, has long been recognized as a neglected period, and it will continue to be neglected as long as we treat colonial history merely as a time of incubation. Now just as an important period has suffered neglect from failure to make a radical change in our point of view, so an important phase of colonial history has suffered similar neglect from a similar cause. I refer to the subject of colonial commerce. The many divisions of this fundamentally important topic have lain hitherto strewn about over the pages of colonial history, veritable *disjecta membra*, without proper unity and co-ordination, and without that grouping of principal, subordinate, incidental, and extraordinary features, which taken together disclose the paramount significance of the whole.

Any study of colonial commerce should begin with a thorough grounding in the commercial policy of England from the beginning of the colonial period, and a thorough understanding of the place of the colonies, not only in England's commercial scheme, but also in the schemes of other maritime states of the European world. England's relations with the colonies were primarily commercial in character, not only because of the wide expanse of water that separated the mother-country from her outlying possessions, but much more because from the beginning to the end of the legal connection, England's interest in the colonies was a commercial interest. British merchants and statesmen valued the colonies just as far as they contributed to the commercial and industrial prosperity at home; and they actively promoted and upheld legislation that brought the colonies within the bonds of the commercial empire. Commerce was, therefore, the cornerstone of the British system. Naturally other

interests, legal, political, institutional, religious, and military, assumed large proportions as the British colonial system was gradually worked out: but in the ultimate analysis it will be found that the building up of strong, self-governing communities in America and the West Indies was a contributory rather than a primary object, furthering the commercial aims of British merchants and statesmen through the establishment of vigorous but dependent groups of producers and consumers; for England was bound to protect and develop the sources of her wealth and power. England valued her colonies exactly as far as they were of commercial importance to her, and it was no accident that the terms "trade" and "plantations" were joined in the same phrase as the title of the British boards of control, or that in the same title "trade" took precedence over "plantations". The commercial history of every colony, without exception though not all in the same measure, was affected by this policy of the mother-country, who, possessing plenary authority, was able to enforce to no inconsiderable extent the policy that she laid down. A study of colonial commerce carries us at once, therefore, into the very heart of that most fundamental of all colonial questions, the relation of the colonies to the sovereign power across the sea.

If we limit our observation to a single colony or to the group of thirteen colonies, as we are more or less bound to do when dealing with colonial history as prefatory to that of the United States, we get an imperfect view of our subject, if, indeed, that can be called a view at all which is taken at such close range. Commerce thus seen appears to be an interesting, but not particularly conspicuous, feature of colonial life. Settlement, government, politics, religion, war, and social life generally have taken precedence of it in the narratives of our writers. If not ignored or treated as an issue of only local or minor consequence, it is used as a convenient text for moralizing on the unwarranted part which a government can take in interfering with the free and natural development of a high-spirited and liberty-loving people. As a rule such an attitude is due to the unprofitable habit of studying colonial history with our ideas warped and distorted by standards of judgment derived from the Revolutionary and national periods, a habit that is formed when colonial history is studied from the wrong end. Mr. Beer is showing us how to correct that habit, and his volumes are teaching us what can be done when the right vantage-point is sought for and attained. We are now beginning to learn that what we call colonial commerce was but part of that ocean-wide commercial activity of England and her merchants which stands as England's most vital possession of the

last two centuries, and thus was concerned with a larger world of obligations and opportunities than that embraced by the thirteen colonies. Construed in this way, colonial commerce grows in dignity and rank and yields to no other phase of our history in the influence it has exercised upon the life of the period to which it belongs.

In presenting our subject from this standpoint, we must in the first place acquire a sound knowledge of the commercial ideas of the period, of mercantilism and the self-sufficing empire in all aspects of their development, and we must exhibit a sympathetic attitude toward views and opinions that had as legitimate a right to a place in the commercial and political thought of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries as have corresponding but different views and opinions a right to exist to-day. We must study understandingly the conditions under which these commercial ideas came into being, and must analyze thoroughly and carefully all orders, proclamations, statutes, and instructions that represent official utterances upon these points; the minutes of subordinate councils and boards; and the letters, pamphlets, and memorials of private persons that contain expressions of individual opinion. Furthermore, we must follow in all their ramifications, in all the colonies dependent on the authority of the British crown, the attempts, whether successful or unsuccessful, to apply these regulations to the actual business of commerce. The Navigation Acts were but the most conspicuous of hundreds of official declarations, defining the limits within which colonial commerce could be carried on; yet even now we understand but imperfectly the influence of those acts upon our colonial history and the extent to which they were obeyed.

In tracing the effect of the Acts of Trade and Navigation, we shall meet with a series of institutions in the colonies that played a continuous and active part in the every-day life of the colonists, and we shall find that as yet scarcely one of these institutions has been made the subject of any comprehensive treatment. The Navigation Acts gave rise to the plantation duty, the collectors and surveyors of customs, and the naval officers, and involved the intricate question of salaries and fees; they brought into existence the courts of vice-admiralty with their complements of officials, their procedure under the civil law, their claims of jurisdiction, and their time-honored antagonism to the courts of common law which had already and everywhere been set up in America. We shall find that the machinery for the control of colonial commerce, thus set in motion, gave added duties, not only to existing departments and boards in England—a subject of no little importance in itself for colonial history—but also to the governors of every colony without exception,

and to the admirals and commanders of ships of war engaged before 1713 (and even after that date on account of West African pirates and Spanish *guardacostas*, in the work of convoying fleets of merchant ships back and forth across the Atlantic); of looking after affairs in Newfoundland, where civil control was vested in an admiral-governor; and of interfering, long before the famous interferences of 1760 to 1765, to prevent illegal trade and the traffic in uncustomed goods. As we follow on in our study of colonial commerce, we meet with the attempts to set up ports of entry in Virginia, Maryland, and elsewhere for the discharge and lading of ships and the checking of illegal trade, and with the complicated problems of embargoes, chiefly in times of war, of the impressment of seamen from colonial vessels in England and from colonial ports in America for the manning of the royal ships, and of the issue of passes, provided by the Admiralty under special treaties between England and the Barbary States, great numbers of which were used in America by American-built ships to guard against capture by the Barbary cruisers, most dangerous of whom were the Algerine pirates. We are concerned with the question of privateering and the issue of letters of marque, and also with that of prizes, the establishment of special prize courts, and the disposition of ships captured in war. We are concerned also with the question of coast defense in America, the employment of frigates and smaller vessels for the guarding of individual colonies, and with the whole subject of piracy, including the efforts made through the navy, the colonial governors, and specially commissioned courts erected for the purpose, to suppress these marauders of the seas. Indirectly, we are concerned with England's attempt to persuade the colonies to produce naval stores for the use of the royal navy, an attempt which played an important part in the industrial history of the continental colonies, especially in New England; and we are also concerned with England's determination to control the supply of masts from the northern American forests, by means of special officials, notably the surveyor-general of the woods and his deputies, whose business was very obnoxious to the northern colonists.

Furthermore, the attempts of the colonists to evade the restrictions that England laid down for the control of navigation and commerce not only resulted in the seizure of scores of ships, their condemnation and sale, and the arousing of a great amount of ill-will and hostility, but they were also responsible, and often directly responsible, for events of political and constitutional importance, such as the loss of the Massachusetts charter, the consolidation of the northern colonies under Andros, the temporary control of Mary-

land and Pennsylvania by the king, and the unsuccessful efforts, lasting nearly half a century, to unite the proprietary and corporate colonies to the crown. These are important events in colonial history and can all be traced immediately or remotely to the demands of England's commercial policy.

Continuing this subject in its further ramifications, we find it leading us on into other aspects of the life of the colonies. Commerce influenced the passing of colonial laws; provoked the king in council to disallow colonial acts, because under the statute of 1696 the colonists were forbidden to have any "Laws, Bye-Laws, Usages or Customs" that were in any way repugnant to the terms of the act, and because the colonial governors were forbidden "to pass any laws by which the Trade or Navigation of the kingdom [might]in any ways be affected";[2] brought about appeals to the High Court of Admiralty from the courts of vice-admiralty in America, and in a few cases at least from the common law courts in the colonies to the

[2] *House of Lords Manuscripts*, new series, II. 483–488, 494–499 (1696–1697); C. O. 5: 1364, pp. 474–476; *Acts of the Privy Council, Colonial*, vol. II., § 1271 (1717); C. O. 324: 10, pp. 443–454, 456–497 (1722); *Acts of the Privy Council, Colonial*, vol. III., § 58 (1724); C. O. 5: 1296, pp. 120–130; *Acts of the Privy Council, Colonial*, IV. 763–764 (1766).

Dr. O. M. Dickerson, in commenting on this paper at the Charleston meeting, expressed his belief that seventy-five per cent. of the "vetoes" of colonial laws must be explained on other than commercial grounds. Until the royal disallowances have been collected and their contents analyzed, we are hardly in a position to speak very positively about their numerical proportions, but after studying with considerable care those in print and in manuscript relating to all the colonies for the entire colonial period, I am convinced that Dr. Dickerson's percentage is too high. Dr. Dickerson must have failed to realize that scores of disallowances apparently concerned with other than commercial matters are found on closer inspection to have a trade motive somewhere lurking in them. This is particularly true of all that deal with financial legislation. But after all can we determine the place of trade and commerce in colonial history by simply counting the number of laws passed and disallowed that deal with this subject? I think not. The colonists had frequent warnings that legislation affecting trade or discriminating in any way against British merchants or British commodities would not be tolerated, and the governors were expressly instructed to veto such laws. It would be surprising, therefore, if any large number of such laws had been passed wittingly by the colonial legislatures. We can obtain a much more accurate estimate by studying the motives underlying British policy in this respect, as seen in the reports of the Board of Trade and of the Council Committee. Among the reasons for disallowance that stand out above all others are two: the impairment of trade and the infringement of the royal prerogative. Many of the other reasons are technical as having to do with the legal aspects of the case, and none of them to anything like the same degree represent the fundamental principles governing the relations of mother-country and colonies as do the two named above. In 1766 the Board of Trade itself summed up the leading motives controlling the disallowance, as "the Commerce and Manufactures of this country", "Your Majesty's Royal Prerogative", and "the Authority of the British Parliament". It will be noticed that trade and commerce are mentioned first. *Acts of the Privy Council, Colonial*, V. 43.

Privy Council. It gave rise to the thousand and one complicated phases of international finance, involving mercantile dealings and transactions, currency, credit, and exchange, gold, silver, copper, and paper money, bills of exchange and rates of exchange, the drift of bullion from colony to colony, and above all that question, sometimes most difficult to answer in the case of individual colonies, of the balance of trade. It touched very closely the attitude of the Board of Trade, the Privy Council, and Parliament toward bills of credit and colonial banking, a phase of our early financial history that has nowhere been studied in its entirety. As we continue to the uttermost reaches of this subtle and penetrating force, we find ourselves in the very centre of colonial life, discovering unexpected traces of its influence upon other phases of colonial activity that seem at first sight far removed from the sphere of the Navigation Acts and all their works.

Thus we see how large is the field within which the commercial policy of England operated and how deep and far-reaching were the effects of this powerful agent in shaping the development of colonial history. In the aggregate, the results of this policy, which England by virtue of her sovereign authority was endeavoring to force upon the colonies, constitute an impressive picture, the details of which are so interwoven with the general life of the colonies as to be inseparable from it. From the historian they deserve and are capable of such treatment as will furnish an orderly and logical presentation of this neglected phase of our history.

Turning now to the second part of our general subject, we shall see that colonial commerce, quite apart from its connection with England's policy, was a dominant interest of the colonists themselves. There is danger lurking in the new point of view we are taking, the danger of giving exaggerated treatment to governmental policy and neglecting those parts of the story that represent colonial activity and private enterprise. We are right in taking our stand in the mother-country and in following thence the diverging lines of governmental influence in the colonies themselves. But when once these features of our subject have been outlined there still remains another and equally important group of subjects to be studied, the actual commercial and industrial conditions in the colonies and the extent to which these conditions reacted upon the policy at home. British governmental policy on one side and colonial organization and development on the other are but the complementary parts of a common subject. Each is incomplete without the other, and neither can be fully understood unless the other has been adequately and impartially presented.

To the colonists in America a commercial and trading life was the natural accompaniment of their geographical location. The colonists did not confine their interests, as do most of our historians, to the fringe of coast from Maine to Georgia. They ranged over a larger world, the world of the North Atlantic, a great ocean-lake, bounded on the east by the coast of two continents, Europe and Africa, and on the west by the coast of a third continent, America. On the northeast, the British Isles occupied a vantage-point of great commercial and strategic importance, while within the ocean area were scores of islands, massed chiefly along the southwestern border or off the coast of Africa, from the Bahamas to Curaçao and from the Azores to the Cape Verde Islands, which held positions of the highest importance for purposes of trade and naval warfare. It is an interesting fact that the British island colonies, and still more those of France, Holland, and Denmark, have been mere names to the students of our history; and it is equally significant that no atlas of American history displays in full upon any of its maps the entire field of colonial life. The American colonists were not landsmen only, they were seafarers also. They faced wide stretches of water, over which they looked, upon which hundreds of them spent their lives, and from which came in largest part their wealth and their profits. Though migration into the interior began early, nearly half the eighteenth century had spent its course before the American colonists turned their faces in serious earnest toward the region of the west. Though the lives of thousands were spent as frontiersmen and pioneers, as many crossed the sea as penetrated the land, for colonial interstate commerce was not by land but by water. In the shaping of colonial careers and colonial governments, sea-faring and trade were only second in importance to the physical conditions of the land upon which the colonists dwelt. No one can write of the history of Portsmouth, Salem, Boston, Newport, New Haven, New York, Philadelphia, or Charleston, or of the tidewater regions of Maryland, Virginia, and North Carolina, without realizing the conspicuous part that commerce played in the lives of those communities and regions. Even within the narrower confines of their own bays and rivers, the colonists of continental America, particularly of the northern part, spent much of their time upon the water. They travelled but rarely by land, unless compelled to do so; they engaged in coastwise trade that carried them from Newfoundland to South Carolina; they built, in all the colonies, but more particularly in New England, hundreds of small craft, which penetrated every harbor, bay, estuary, and navigable river along a coast remarkable for the natural advantages it offered for transit, trans-

port, and traffic by water; and they devoted no small part of their time and energies as governors, councillors, and assemblymen to the furthering of a business which directly or indirectly concerned every individual, and which became more exigent and effective as the numbers of the colonists increased and their economic resources expanded.

In elaborating this phase of our subject we are called upon to deal with certain aspects which, though inseparable from the larger theme, are more strictly colonial in their characteristics and connections. I refer to staple products, shipping, trade routes, and markets, and in close connection with these are the various aspects of commercial legislation in the colonies themselves. A study of staple products demands that we survey the entire agricultural and industrial history of the colonies from Hudson Bay to Surinam, and enter upon a discriminating analysis of the economic importance of their chief products from furs to sugar and from fish to lime-juice. A study of shipping for the purpose in hand demands that we find out where ships were built, what was their tonnage, and how they were manned, and acquire some knowledge of the fitness of certain types of vessels for ocean, island, and coastwise service, according to their size and rig. The study of trade routes, one of the most varied and tangled of problems, demands that we determine the customary routes with all their variations, examine the reasons why these routes came into being, analyze the conditions attending traffic by these routes, and follow each route from port to port, as far as descriptions, logs, and registers will allow, instead of being content to see the captains and masters sail out into the unknown and return from the unknown, with very indefinite ideas as to where they had been and what they had done there. A study of markets requires that we have some fairly exact knowledge of the staple demands of other countries and colonies than our own, of the conditions under which our colonial staples were distributed, and of the nature of the commodities that other countries could offer to the captains and supercargoes wherewith to lade their vessels, either for the return trip, for the next stage of a long voyage that might cover many countries, or for the kind of huckstering business that many masters engaged in, going from port to port as they saw opportunities for profit.

Having presented these general features of this phase of our subject, I should like to state somewhat more exactly what I have in mind, and to discuss at somewhat greater length topics which, though commonly classed as economic, are in no way the peculiar property of the student of so-called economic history. First of all as to staple

products. In the far north, from Hudson Bay to Nova Scotia, Maine, and New Hampshire, furs, fish, and lumber predominated. These same staples were also of importance to central and southern New England, in addition to whale-fins and whale-oil, but the main products here were agricultural, including live-stock, naval stores, and also a great variety of provisions, many in their natural state and others dried, salted, and pickled, with some articles of wooden ware, among which were jocularly classed the wooden clocks and nutmegs of Connecticut. New England differed from her neighbor colonies to the immediate southward, not so much in the character of the staples exported as in the possession of large numbers of shipping ports through which she sent her surplus products to the world outside. New York, including within its area of supply Long Island, Westchester County, and the Hudson and Mohawk river valleys, exported a similar variety of domestic staples, with a greater amount of bread-stuffs and peltry, but lagged behind such towns as Salem, Boston, Newport, and Philadelphia in the extent of her export business. Though sharing with Albany and Perth Amboy the trade of the region, she surpassed all the others as an entrepôt for re-exported commodities from the tropical colonies. Philadelphia was wholly absorbed in commerce, and early became the main port, with Burlington and Salem as subsidiary, through which the farmers of Pennsylvania and West New Jersey and the tobacco raisers of Delaware sent their supplies. She specialized in wheat, beef, pork, and lumber, and during colonial times was the greatest mercantile city of the colonial world. She raised almost no staple suitable for export to England and did but a small re-exporting business. As she drew practically all manufactured commodities from England, the balance of trade in that direction was heavily against her. Thus we have in one group what are commonly known as the "bread colonies", possessed of diversified staples, similar in many cases to those that England produced for herself.

South of Mason and Dixon's line we enter the group of single staple colonies, in which the export was confined to a single commodity or to a small number of commodities. Maryland and Virginia raised very little except tobacco until after the middle of the eighteenth century, when the export of grain, largely to the West Indies, marked the beginnings of trade with the tropical colonies and laid the foundations of the prosperity of Baltimore and Norfolk. North Carolina in the seventeenth century was relatively unimportant as an exporting colony, supplying only tobacco to New England traders who shipped it to England: but afterward, particularly in the southern section, from the plantations along the Cape Fear

River, she developed a variety of staples, live-stock, naval stores, and provisions, and entered upon a considerable exporting activity. South Carolina was a long time in finding her staple industry, but the enumeration of rice in 1704 shows that out of the diversified commerce of the earlier era had come the one product that was to be the chief source of her wealth. In the eighteenth century rice, indigo, naval stores, furs, cypress, and cedar made up the bulk of her cargoes. Among the island colonies, Bermuda and the Bahamas, having no sugar and little tobacco, played but little part in the commercial life of the colonies. But with the West Indies—Jamaica, Barbadoes, and the Leeward Islands—we are face to face with that group known as the "sugar colonies" which formed till 1760 the leading factor in England's commercial scheme. Conspicuous among colonial staples were the products of these islands, sugar, molasses, and rum, with a small amount of indigo, cotton, ginger, allspice, and woods for cabinet work and dyeing purposes, some of which came from the mainland of Honduras. The contrast of the "bread colonies" and the "sugar colonies" forms one of the leading features of colonial history, and in their respective careers we have the operation of forces that explain many things in the course of colonial development.

With shipping we deal first of all with the actual extent of the ship-building industry, regarding which at present we have no very exact statistical information. Weeden has given us for New England an admirable, though rather miscellaneous, collection of facts that stand badly in need of organization. All the leading towns of the North had dock-yards and built ships, and many of the smaller towns on sea-coast and navigable rivers laid the keels of lesser craft. So rapidly did the business increase that New England after 1700 was not only doing a large carrying trade on her own account, but was selling vessels in all parts of the Atlantic world—in the southern colonies and in the West Indies, Spain, Portugal, and England. The golden age of New England ship-building was during the first third of the eighteenth century, and so rapid was the growth of the business that in 1724 English shipwrights of the port of London would have had a law passed forbidding the New Englanders to build ships or compelling them to sell their ships after their arrival in England. But here the colonists scored, for, as the counsellor of the Board of Trade said, the English ship-builders had no remedy, since by the Acts of Navigation the shipping of the plantations was in all respects to be considered as English-built. Later the business fell off, the centre of the ship-building activity moved north to north-eastern Massachusetts and New Hampshire, and the English builders

ceased to be concerned. New York, too, had her ship-yards, as had northern New Jersey, that of Rip Van Dam occupying the water front on the North River in the rear of Trinity churchyard; and Philadelphia, the chief ship-building city in America, in the years between 1727 and 1766, built nearly half the entire number that were entered in the ship-registry of the port during those years. In the South ship-building was less of a negligible factor than has commonly been assumed. Maryland in 1700 had 161 ships, sloops, and shallops, built or building along the Chesapeake, and some of these were large enough to engage in the English trade. Virginia built chiefly, but not entirely, for river and bay traffic, and North Carolina, though hampered by the want of good ports and harbors, made ship-building one of the established industries of the colony. South Carolina carried on her great trade with Europe chiefly in British bottoms and during the eighteenth century had scarcely a dozen ships at any one time that belonged to the province. Among the island colonies only Bermuda and the Bahamas played any part as ship-builders; while the others, early denuded of available timber, remained entirely dependent on outside carriers.

In size, the New England built vessels were mainly under 100 tons, with a large proportion of vessels of less than 20 tons, in which, however, ocean voyages were sometimes made. Occasionally vessels were built of 250 and 300 tons, and a few, monster ships for those days, reached 700 and 800 tons. Gabriel Thomas tells us that ships of 200 tons were built in Philadelphia, but the largest ship entered in the register mentioned above was of 150 tons, with others ranging all the way down to 4 tons. The Maryland lists mention vessels of 300 and 400 tons built in that colony, but the number could not have been large. In 1767 a vessel of 256 tons was offered for sale before launching in Virginia.

Five varieties of vessels were in use: (1) ships and pinks, three-masters with square rig; (2) snows and barks, also three-masters, but with one mast rigged fore-and-aft; (3) ketches, brigs, and brigantines, with two masts but of different sizes, combining square rig with fore-and-aft, and schooners, a native American product, with fore-and-aft rig on both masts, though in its development the schooner often carried more masts than two, without change in the cut of the sails; (4) sloops, shallops, and smacks, single-masters carrying fore-and-aft sails; and (5) boats without masts—hog-boats, fly-boats, wherries, row-boats, and canoes. Bermuda boats were conspicuous among colonial vessels, because rigged with mutton-leg sails. No statement regarding relative numbers can be made until far more information has been gathered than exists at present, but

the proportion of three-masters, two-masters, and single-masters was somewhat in the ratio of one, two, and three. Of the numbers of seamen we know as yet very little.

Turning now to the complicated question of routes, which criss-crossed so bewilderingly the waters of the Atlantic, we can, I think, group the courses without difficulty, if we keep in mind the nature of supply and demand and the requirements of the Navigation Acts.

The first determining factor was the requirement that all the enumerated commodities—tobacco, sugar, cotton, indigo, ginger, fustic and other dye woods, and later cocoa, molasses, rice, naval stores, copper, beaver and other skins—be carried directly to England, or from one British plantation to another for the supply of local wants, whence, if re-exported, they were to go to England. This requirement gives us our first set of trade routes. The chief staples of all the colonies from Maryland to Barbadoes were carried to England in fleets of vessels provided by English merchants that during the days of convoys went out in the early winter, about Christmas time, and returned to England in the spring. The providing of naval protection in times of war was a matter of constant concern to the Admiralty, while the gathering of vessels and the arranging of seasons was one of concern to the merchants. After 1713 when convoying became largely unnecessary except to the West Indies, individual ships sailed at varying times, frequently returning from Maryland or Virginia as late as the end of August. We may call this route back and forth across the ocean between England and her southern and West Indian colonies the great thoroughfare of our colonial commerce. It was regular, dignified, and substantial. Out of it grew two subsidiary routes, one from New York and New England with re-exported commodities to England, and one from South Carolina and Georgia to southern Europe under the privilege allowed after 1730 and 1735 of exporting rice directly to all points south of Cape Finisterre. Thus we have a series of direct routes from nearly all of the American colonies converging upon England and one route from South Carolina and Georgia diverging to any point south of France, but generally confined to the Iberian Peninsula and the Straits. Along these routes were carried a definite series of commodities, raised, with the exception of naval stores and beaver, entirely in colonies south of Pennsylvania. To this commercial activity must be added the traffic in these same commodities among the colonists themselves, a service chiefly in the hands of the northerners, who carried tobacco, rice, logwood, and sugar from the southern and West Indian colonies to their own ports and there either consumed them, re-exported them to England,

or in the case of sugar and molasses worked them over into rum and shipped the latter where they pleased.

When we consider the export activities of the northern colonies, we find ourselves involved in a more varied and complicated series of voyages. First, all the colonies north of Maryland, except Pennsylvania, had a certain but not very extensive trade directly with England. They carried in greater or less quantities an assortment of furs, fish, rawhides, lumber, whale-fins and whale-oil, naval stores, wheat, wheat flour, hops, and a little iron, though the largest amount of exported iron came from Maryland and Virginia. They also re-exported tobacco, sugar, molasses, rum, cocoa, hard woods, and dye woods. All these they carried in their own ships as a rule, and because their own products were not sufficient to balance what they wished to buy, they frequently sold their ships also to English merchants. Salem, Newport, and New York were the chief centres of the English trade. Secondly, the northern colonies carried on a very large trade in non-enumerated commodities with the countries of Europe. To various ports, from the Baltic to the Mediterranean, they sent quantities of "merchantable" fish, lumber, flour, train oil, and rice and naval stores before they were enumerated, chiefly to Spain, Portugal, southern French ports, and Leghorn, the mart of the Mediterranean. A few ships appear to have crept through the Sound into the Baltic; others, very rarely, went up the Adriatic to Venice; and in the case of a few enterprising merchants, notably John Ross of Philadelphia, vessels were sent to India and the East, though in 1715 New England reported no trade there, only a few privateers having occasionally "strol'd that way and [taken] some rich prizes".

The bulk of the northern trade, however, was not with Europe but with the West Indies and with the other continental colonies. The ramifications of this branch of colonial commerce were almost endless, the routes followed were most diverse, and the commodities exported included almost every staple, native or foreign, that was current in the colonial world. Philadelphia and New York traded chiefly with the West Indies and concerned themselves less than did New England with the coastwise traffic; but the New Englanders, in their hundreds of vessels of small tonnage, went to Newfoundland and Annapolis Royal with provisions, salt, and rum, to New York, the Jerseys, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Bermuda, and the Caribbee Islands, peddling every known commodity that they could lay their hands on—meats, vegetables, fruits, flour, Indian meal, refuse fish, oil, candles, soap, butter, cider, beer, cranberries, horses, sheep, cows, and oxen, pipe-

staves, deal boards, hoops, and shingles, earthenware and woodenware, and other similar commodities of their own; and tobacco, sugar, rum, and molasses, salt, naval stores, wines, and various manufactured goods which they imported from England. They went to Monte Cristi, Cape François, Surinam, and Curaçao, to the islands off the coast of Africa, commonly known as the Wine Islands, and there they trafficked and bargained as only the New Englander knew how to traffic and bargain. It was a peddling and huckstering business, involving an enormous amount of petty detail, frequent exchanges, and a constant lading and unlading as the captains and masters moved from port to port. Sometimes great rafts of lumber were floated down from Maine, New Hampshire, and the Delaware, and not infrequently New England ships went directly to Honduras for logwood and to Tortuga and Turks Island for salt.

Let us consider the return routes. With the southern and West Indian colonies the problem was a simple one. The merchant ships from England went as a rule directly to the colonies, generally laden with English and Continental manufactured goods that according to the act of 1663 could be obtained by the colonists only through England. They followed usually the same route coming and going, though occasionally a ship-captain would go from England to Guinea where he would take on a few negroes for the colonies. Maryland seems to have obtained nearly all her negroes in that way.

But with the northern colonies, where the vessel started in the first instance from the colony, the routes were rarely the same. A vessel might go to England, huckstering from port to port until the cargo was disposed of, and then return to America with manufactured goods. It might go to England with lumber, flour, furs, and naval stores, then back to Newfoundland for fish, then to Lisbon or the Straits, then to England with Continental articles, and thence back to the starting point. It might go directly to Spain, Portugal, or Italy, trying one port after another, Cadiz, Bilbao, Alicante, Carthagena, Marseilles, Toulon, Leghorn, and Genoa, thence to England, and thence to America. It might go directly to the Wine Islands and return by the same route with the wines of Madeira and Fayal and the Canaries, though it was a debatable question whether Canary wines were not to be classed with Continental commodities and so to be carried to America by way of England only. It might go to Spain or Portugal, thence to the Wine Islands, thence to Senegambia or Goree or the Guinea coast for beeswax, gums, and ivory, thence back to Lisbon and home by way of England; or, if it were a slave ship, it might go to the Guinea coast, thence to Barbadoes, and home, or as was probably common, to

Barbadoes first, thence to Africa, thence back to the West Indies and home, with a mixed cargo of negroes, sugar, and cash. Frequently the captain sold his cargo and even his ship for cash, and if he did this in Europe, or in England to London or Bristol merchants, he would either return with the money or invest it in manufactured goods, which he would ship on some homeward-bound vessel, returning himself with his invoice. With the New Englander, and to a somewhat lesser degree with the New Yorker and Philadelphian, the variations were as great as were the opportunities for traffic.

In this brief statement, I have given but a bare outline of a difficult and unworked problem in colonial history. Did time allow I should like to consider certain supplemental phases of the general subject that are deserving of careful attention. These are, first, the methods of distributing colonial commodities in England and Wales and of sending them into the interior, into Scotland, and into Ireland; secondly, the character and extent of the plantation trade with Ireland and Scotland directly, a matter of some interest and a good deal of difficulty; and thirdly, the re-exportation of tobacco, sugar, and other tropical and semi-tropical products from England to the European Continent. But upon these subjects I can say nothing here. One topic must, however, be briefly discussed, the question of illicit trade and smuggling.

The nature of the smuggling that went on during our colonial period is very simple, though the extent of it and the relation of it to the total volume of colonial trade is very difficult to determine. It is doubtful if satisfactory conclusions can ever be reached on these points, owing both to the lack of evidence and to its unsatisfactory character. For the most part smuggling took three forms: first, direct trade in enumerated commodities between the colonies and European countries, and participated in by English, Irish, American, and West Indian ships, trafficking to Holland, Hamburg, Spain, Portugal, Marseilles, Toulon, and other Mediterranean ports; secondly, a direct return trade to America or the West Indies, without touching at England as the law required, and participated in by the same ships, carrying the dry goods, wines, and brandies of Europe. The latter traffic had many aspects, for it included the trade between American British colonies and American foreign colonies, in which enumerated commodities, or in many cases non-enumerated commodities, were exchanged for European goods, purchasable at St. Eustatius, St. Thomas, or Curaçao, or at Monte Cristi in Hispaniola. There can be little doubt that this trade attained considerable proportions and was one of the channels whereby brandies, cocoa, silks, linens, and the like came into the colonies. There was

much smuggled liquor drunk in the West Indies, and many were the damask gowns and silk stockings worn; and I fear that there were many things enjoyed in Newport, Boston, and Philadelphia that came either directly from France or by way of the foreign West Indies. Indeed, it seems to have been a common practice for ships of nearly every continental colony to go to Curaçao and return with European dry goods and cocoa.

Thirdly, there was a trade of the northern colonies with the foreign West Indies, in which a vessel would carry a general cargo to Jamaica or Barbadoes, sell all or a part of it for cash—gold or light silver—pass on to the French colonies of Guadeloupe, Martinique, or Santo Domingo, or to the Dutch colony of St. Eustatius, and there buy, more cheaply than at Jamaica, Barbadoes, or the Leeward Islands, their return cargo of sugar and molasses. There was nothing strictly illegal about this traffic, unless the northern trader laid out a part of his cash in European dry goods and smuggled them into the colonies by one or other of the many contrivances so well known to all West Indian traders; but it was injurious to the British sugar colonies in depriving them of a part of their market and draining them of much of their cash. It became illegal, however, when, after the passage of the Molasses Act, expressly designed to prevent this traffic, the Northerner evaded the duties imposed by this act on foreign sugar and molasses. Then if he brought in foreign sugar and molasses without paying the duty and on the same voyage stowed away hidden bales of Holland linens and French silks, casks of French brandies, and pipes of claret, he committed a double breach of the law. Lastly, if we were to go into the problem of illicit trade in all its phases, we should have to consider a certain amount of petty smuggling off Newfoundland, in Ireland, and at the Isle of Man, and by way of the Channel Islands; but upon these points our knowledge is at present very meagre.

A useful addition to this paper would be a statement regarding our sources of information, in manuscript in England and America, and in print in a great number of accessible works. There is an immense amount of available material in the form of correspondence, accounts, registers, lists, reports, returns, log-books, port books, statements of claims, letter-books, and the like, which, though often difficult to use, are all workable and illuminating to the student who has organized his plan of treatment in a logical and not a haphazard fashion. The subject is a fascinating one, and the more one studies it, the more important and suggestive it becomes. I cannot believe that the future will show such a disregard of its significance as the past has done, for when its place is once recognized and its in-

fluence determined, colonial history will become not only fuller and richer, but also more picturesque, and the life of the colonists will appear as broader and more varied. And just as the local field will be enlarged and extended, so will the place of the colonies in the British and European systems of commercial empire be given its proper setting, and the balance between things imperial and things colonial will be restored. Only when such balance has been sought for and attained will the way be prepared for a history of the colonial period that is comprehensive in scope, scientific in conception, and thoroughly scholarly in its mode of treatment.

CHARLES M. ANDREWS.

THE ANGLICAN OUTLOOK ON THE AMERICAN COLONIES IN THE EARLY EIGHTEENTH CENTURY[1]

In Burke's *Reflections on the Revolution in France*, there is a notable passage describing the importance of the Established Church in the English social fabric. He speaks of the establishment as "the first of our prejudices, not a prejudice destitute of reason, but involving in it profound and extensive wisdom". In a spirit of veneration like that in which he contemplated the national constitution, he saw in the church the living embodiment in the present of the "early received, and uniformly continued sense of mankind".[2] What Burke wrote in 1790 applied with greater force to the early eighteenth century. Whatever its spiritual limitations may have been, the popularity of the church was then so great as to endanger the Revolution settlement of 1689, and the grudging concessions to dissenters embodied in the Toleration Act.

In sharp contrast to the situation at home was the humiliating weakness of the church beyond the sea. In the new English commonwealths, this "first of English prejudices" had largely lost its force. Of the continental colonies, which in 1700 included a great majority of the white population in America under the English flag, only the two Chesapeake provinces of Virginia and Maryland had a measurably effective establishment of the Anglican Church; and even here English ecclesiastical law and custom were largely inoperative. Without a resident bishop, the important offices of confirmation and ordination could not be administered and though the Bishop of London was represented in Virginia by a commissary, a considerable part of the episcopal jurisdiction was exercised by the colonial governor. Commissary and parish clergy alike were dependent upon the passing moods of the laity to an extent quite inconsistent with the approved Anglican theory. In New England the situation was even worse. There was indeed an effective church establishment, but it was based upon principles sharply antagonistic to those of the mother-country. The other colonies had been

[1] A paper read in the conference on American religious history at the meeting of the American Historical Association in Charleston, December 29, 1913.

[2] *Works* (London, 1852), IV. 225–226.

founded by proprietors, who though often themselves Anglicans, sometimes indeed as in the case of Lord Clarendon aggressive High Churchmen, were controlled mainly by considerations of economic interest and trusted that a variety of religious opinions, held by people so far away, would be "no breach of the unity and uniformity"[3] thought necessary at home. In the most vigorous of the middle colonies, the prevailing religious influence was that of the Society of Friends, whose members combined the most thoroughgoing theories of religious individualism with an extraordinary capacity for cooperative action in defense of their common interests.

Under these depressing conditions a few energetic churchmen, in the first decade of the eighteenth century, took up the difficult problem of colonial missions. At a time when merchants and statesmen were working with fair success for an imperial system in trade and government, it was natural to think also of an imperialistic policy for the national church. This ecclesiastical imperialism was doubtless supported in part by political considerations; but the character of its chief promoters, many of whom were actively associated with various forms of practical piety at home, is sufficient to show that the movement had also a truly religious aspect.[4]

The two chief agencies of Anglican extension in the colonies during this period were the Bishop of London and the Society for Propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts, chartered by William III. in 1701.[5] The jurisdiction of the diocese of London in the colonies and the long-continued service of Bishop Compton, which, beginning under Charles II., covered the greater part of Queen Anne's reign, have been described in Cross's well-known monograph.[6] The work of the society, sometimes designated as the Venerable Society, or more briefly still as the S. P. G., has been described in various publications written from a distinctly Anglican point of view, of which the most valuable is Mr. C. F. Pascoe's *Two Centuries of the S. P. G.*, based mainly on the Journal of the society and the correspondence on file in its London office.[7] It is the purpose of the present paper

[3] Carolina charter, 1663, § 18.

[4] Dr. Thomas Bray is perhaps the most notable for the variety of religious societies with which he was associated. For other illustrations see C. F. Pascoe, *Two Hundred Years of the S. P. G.*, and Overton, *Life in the English Church, 1660–1714* (index of both, *sub* T. Bray, Josiah Woodward, Thomas Tenison, Robert Nelson). See also Overton, ch. V. ("Religious and Philanthropical Societies"). *Cf.* Allen and McClure, *History of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge*, ch. II.

[5] Charter in Pascoe, *op. cit.*, pp. 932–934.

[6] A. L. Cross, *The Anglican Episcopate and the American Colonies.*

[7] The most important of the early accounts is that of Humphreys, secretary of the society, *An Historical Account of the Incorporated Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts* (London, 1730).

to interpret, in the light of this original material, the Anglican outlook on the colonial problem in the early years of the eighteenth century.

The S. P. G., though not technically an official agency of the church, had nevertheless a quasi-official character.[8] Thomas Tenison, archbishop of Canterbury, was named in the charter as the first president of the society and he was regularly chosen to the same office by annual election as long as he lived. Tenison was a moderate churchman, more conspicuous for practical piety than for controversial theology, and his activities in relation to the colonial church have not been adequately recognized.[9] The minutes of the society show conclusively that his presidency was of no perfunctory kind. By a standing order of the society, minutes of its own action and that of its executive committee were to be sent to the archbishop as well as to the Bishop of London. In the later years of Tenison's presidency, when he rarely attended the sessions in person, it was usual to make action on important matters conditional upon his approval.[10] The relations of the society with the Bishop of London were also very close. He was asked for information about colonial needs and in turn depended upon the society for the funds required to support the American clergy. In fact his control of the colonial church was materially restricted by his financial dependence; for the society, not content with episcopal testimonials, conducted its own examination of candidates for the missionary service, reserving the right of dismissal for misconduct.[11] In general there was friendly and effective co-operation, with occasional friction, as in 1709, when the bishop expressed his disappointment that there should have been "any rubb" in the appointment on liberal terms of one of his candidates, who in his opinion "would do as much good as ten others".[12] Other bishops took a more or less active part in the society's work. Among them was Gilbert Burnet, who with all his multifarious activities as churchman, politician, and historian was able to attend numerous meetings of the society.[13] Burnet belonged to the latitu-

[8] The activity of Dr. Thomas Bray in the founding of this society and of its predecessor, the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, is well known. Doubtless his part was larger than that of any other individual. See Steiner, *Rev. Thomas Bray*, in Maryland Hist. Soc. *Fund Publications*, no. 37. *Cf.* Pascoe, ch. I.

[9] W. H. Hutton's "Tenison" in *Dict. of Nat. Biog.* *Cf.* Overton, *Life in the English Church, 1660–1714*, pp. 60–62.

[10] S. P. G. Journal, May 17, 1706, and *passim*, *e. g.*, June, July, 1711.

[11] *Ibid.*, September 17, 1703; November 17, December 15, 1704; May 18, June 15, 1705.

[12] S. P. G., Letters Received, A V., nos. 29–32.

[13] *E. g.*, S. P. G. Journal, 1711, *passim*.

dinarian group which included also White Kennett, afterwards bishop of Peterborough. Of the High Church bishops who took an active part in the society's affairs, Patrick, bishop of Ely, was perhaps the most notable. Thus the outlook of the society on the American situation was in the main that of responsible leaders in the Church of England.

Notwithstanding its connection with a richly endowed church, the financial resources of the society were meagre indeed. In 1707 the annual charges for missions and schools amounted to £1065 with yearly subscriptions not exceeding £759; and at the next annual meeting it was reported that the annual income from all sources including casual benefactions was less than a thousand pounds, with fixed and contingent charges more than £400 in excess of that amount.[14] In 1709–1710 the auditing committee reported a yearly charge of £1251 exclusive of about £150 for books given to missionaries. The disbursements exceeded the certain yearly income by nearly £500.[15] Many members, including some of the bishops, failed to pay their dues promptly. In 1706 the Bishops of Hereford and Bristol had to be notified of arrears and in 1708 the Bishop of Gloucester asked to have his subscription stopped. In March, 1709/10, members were in arrears for dues to the amount of £720. Bishop Burnet urged greater efforts to secure contributions from the merchants of London and other towns interested in the colonial trade, but little was accomplished.[16] In short, the church as a whole hardly appreciated the importance of its task.

The stipends paid to missionaries were small. Some of the first grants were as low as £50 per annum, with smaller allowances for books, to which must be added the royal bonus of £20 paid to each clergyman on his entering the colonial service.[17] Since the society worked mainly in provinces where there was no general establishment of the Anglican Church and since the missionaries them-

[14] *Ibid.*, July 18, 1707; February 20, 1707/8; Letters Received A IV., no. 25.

[15] S. P. G. Journal, February 17, 1709/10. The *Abstracts* for the next three years show somewhat larger amounts. In one year the estimated disbursements were £1745.

[16] S. P. G. Letters Received, A I., April 5, 1703; Journal, February 21, 1706/7. Some conspicuous London merchants were, however, enlisted. Micajah Perry, one of the best known and most influential of the "merchants trading to the colonies" became a member and made a gift of land in New Jersey. *Ibid.*, January 20, February 20, March 3, 1709/10. *Cf.* Burnet's *Sermon before the Society*, 1703/4, p. 22: "You great Dealers in Trade, who have had so plentiful a Harvest in Temporal things, from the Productions of those Countries, and from the Industry of our Colonies settled among them, are, in a more special manner, bound to minister to them in spiritual things."

[17] *E. g.*, S. P. G. Journal, June 15, 1705.

selves were often reluctant to alienate actual or possible adherents by premature appeals for money, there was often little to depend upon besides the grants from England. To meet this situation various plans were offered. In 1701 Lewis Morris of New Jersey proposed that no one be appointed to "a great Benefice" in England, "but such as shall oblige themselves to preach three years gratis in America"; with part of the living the incumbent was to maintain a curate for his English parish.[18] In 1702 George Keith and others made a similar proposal.[19] The favorite solution of the problem of clerical maintenance was the enactment by the colonial legislatures of laws securing a general establishment of the Anglican Church. In most provinces, however, especially in the middle colonies, this solution was impracticable; and where, as in South Carolina, the attempt was partially successful, it did much to embitter the politics of the province.

With small stipends, the ordeal of an ocean voyage,[20] and the numerous hardships of colonial life in prospect, the missionary service did not appeal to many of the English clergy and some of those who applied were evidently men who could not make their way at home. The Journal contains numerous instances of missionaries found guilty of various forms of misconduct, though they show also an increasing care in the selection of candidates.[21] Several Scottish clergymen were enlisted to offset the lack of suitable English material, sometimes with unsatisfactory results, as when a Delaware parish complained of the Scottish clergy in the neighborhood and urged that "no minister of that nation" be sent to them.[22] Nevertheless some good men were attracted to the service. Governor Hunter of New York, by no means an undiscriminating admirer of the Anglican clergy, thought he had in his neighborhood "a good Sett of Missionaries who generally labour hard in their Functions and are men of good lives and ability".[23]

The first important move of the society was the sending out of

[18] Memorial in S. P. G. Journal, app. B, no. 1.

[19] Statement by Keith *et al.*, *ibid.*, no. 24.

[20] A vivid description of fairly common experiences is given in a letter of B. Dennis to the secretary, S. P. G. Letters Received, A VI., no. 76. The society itself recognized "how natural it is for Young Divines to decline the Difficulties and Dangers of such a Mission, if they have any tolerable Prospects nearer Home". Annual *Abstract*, 1710/11.

[21] S. P. G. Letters Received, A I., no. 31; A II., no. 5; A V., no. 47; A VI., no. 26. Journal, August 18, 1704; March 2, May 18, 1705; April 19, 1706; November 18, 1709.

[22] S. P. G. Letters Received, A V., no. 44.

[23] *Ibid.*, A VI., no. 7; *cf. N. J. Docs.*, IV. 155–158, 173–174. In addition to the missionaries a number of schoolmasters were employed by the society.

George Keith as an itinerant missionary to survey the whole colonial field. This able and picturesque individual had an erratic ecclesiastical record. Beginning as a Scottish Presbyterian, he became a leader among the Pennsylvania Quakers. A little later he organized a seceding group called after him the Keithian Quakers, and in 1700 he entered the last phase by taking orders in the Anglican Church, to which he brought the fiery zeal and controversial temper of a recent convert.[24] On his way across the Atlantic Keith made a notable disciple in the person of John Talbot, a navy chaplain who gave up his position to accompany Keith on his missionary journey. The two men proved congenial spirits. Both were hard fighters and indefatigable workers. Confident of the justice of their cause, they seem never to have been so happy as when engaged in plain-spoken, not to say violent, controversy with their Puritan, and more especially, Quaker opponents.[25] How effective they were in this campaign, it is not easy to say. The Anglicans were generally proud of Keith and thought he had been successful in winning proselytes. The ardent John Talbot was especially enthusiastic about his colleague, whom he called "an able Disputant and a Perfect honest man . . . in a word *Hereticorum Malleus*".[26] The American Quakers, who had been duly warned of Keith's coming, were equally confident that the victory rested with them. "As to that Implacable Adversary of Truth and the People of God, G. K.", wrote the Pennsylvania Yearly Meeting, "he hath in the main done Truth no disservice in these parts, tho' he has done his utmost Towards it."[27]

In one respect at any rate friends and enemies agree. Keith's missionary journey was evidently conceived as a kind of ecclesiastical duel in which the champions of orthodoxy crossed lances with the defenders of heresy. The requirements of heathen and infidels

[24] "Keith" in *Dict. of Nat. Biog.*; Perry, *Hist. of the Amer. Episcopal Church*, vol. I., ch. XII.

[25] Keith's journal was soon afterwards printed under the title, *A Journal of Travels from New-Hampshire to Caratuck on the Continent of North-America* (London, 1706). The manuscript copy of the journal in the society's records varies considerably from the printed text. See Journal, 1704–1706, *passim*, especially September 15, 1704, and January, February, 1705/6; also Journal, app. A, no. 51. Keith's final report was preceded by a number of other communications sent in during the course of his journey. The John Carter Brown Library at Providence reports the acquisition of a large number of Keith's tracts. A biography of Keith, written from the standpoint of historical scholarship rather than that of ecclesiastical partizanship, is much to be desired, and would have real importance for the religious history of his time in England and America.

[26] Lewis Morris to the secretary, Letters Received, A I., no. 48; Nicholson in Journal, app. A, nos. 43, 44; Talbot in Letters Received, A I., no. 119.

[27] London Yearly Meeting (Devonshire House MSS.), Epistles Sent, I. 303–396, and Epistles Received, I. 388.

fell into the background and the chief thought in this long tour from New England to North Carolina was to reclaim dissenters who though they might "profess and call themselves Christians" were conceived at their best as Christians of a decidedly inferior type, and at their worst as hardly better, or even worse, than the infidels themselves. There were some acrimonious controversies with Puritan divines in New England;[28] but the middle colonies were the chief battleground at first and here the Quakers clearly stood out as the most inveterate and formidable antagonists.[29]

It is doubtless possible to emphasize too much the temper displayed in this preliminary tour. While this controversy was going on and after Keith's departure for England in 1704, the society gradually developed the more permanent features of its work. In South Carolina the sending of several missionaries strengthened materially the position of the Church of England, and it was possible to secure some legislation for their support. The insular colonies with Maryland and Virginia remained, for the most part, outside the society's sphere of action. In the middle colonies, the society found only a few scattered parishes of the Anglican Church, notably at New York and Philadelphia, and it was to this region that the largest number of missionaries was sent. In New England there was already a fairly strong church at Boston. Though some other attempts were made in Massachusetts, notably at Braintree,[30] the early efforts of the S. P. G. in this section were centred largely in Rhode Island, with the beginnings of an advance from New York into western Connecticut, the full effect of which was not apparent until many years later.

What now was the primary object of the society in America? Was it the conversion of heathen and infidels or the restoration of Quakers and Puritans to the Anglican fold? The charter itself certainly points to the English colonists as the chief objects of the society's care. Because of the lack of suitable maintenance for the clergy, many of the king's subjects, it was said, "do want the administration of God's Word and Sacraments and seem to be abandoned to Atheism and Infidelity". Besides providing maintenance for the parish clergy, such other measures were to be taken "as may be necessary for the Propagation of the Gospel in those parts". The danger from "Popish superstition and Idolatry" is mentioned,

[28] Keith to Bishop of London, September 4, 1703, in S. P. G. Letters Received, A I., no. 121. In this letter he describes his pamphlet warfare with President Willard of Harvard and Increase Mather. *Cf.* A I., nos. 45, 50.

[29] Keith to Bray, Letters Received, A I., no. 87; "Account of the State of the Church, 1702", in S. P. G. Journal, app. B, no. 24.

[30] *Cf.* Perry, *Hist. Collections relating to the American Colonial Church*, III.

but there is no reference to Protestant dissenters nor to the needs of Indians and negroes.[31]

The Dean of Lincoln in his anniversary sermon of 1702 put first the duty of settling "the State of Religion as well as may be among our own people there", and next the conversion of the natives.[32] From the beginning both interests were recognized in some measure, and special attention was given to the establishment of an Iroquois mission. The society engaged in a voluminous but inconclusive correspondence on this subject with a Dutch clergyman, Godfrey Dellius, who had lived in New York and was ready to accept Episcopal ordination; and in 1704 a small subsidy was paid to a Dutch minister at Albany for service among the Indians.[33] Unsuccessful efforts were also made to secure money for this purpose from the Puritan managers of the older "Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in New England".[34] Finally Thorogood Moor, an Anglican clergyman, was selected for this work; but on his arrival at Albany in 1704 his enthusiasm was chilled by the difficulties which confronted him and he soon gave up his post to engage in more congenial labors among the settlers of New Jersey. He consoled himself with the thought that Indian missions could be prosecuted more successfully after the English had been reformed. Besides, the English were rapidly increasing in numbers while the Indians were likely to disappear altogether.[35] Moor thought it probable that in forty years not an Indian would be "seen in our America". "God's Providence in this matter" seemed to him "very wonderful", though he agreed that rum drinking and "some new distempers we have brought amongst them" had contributed largely to this providential result. A missionary sent to the South Carolina frontier was equally discouraged and accepted a parish near Charleston instead.[36]

It was hard to find men in the English church at all comparable to

[31] Charter of 1701 in Pascoe, *Two Hundred Years of the S. P. G.*, pp. 932–935. In early sermons before the society the superior missionary zeal of the Roman Church is mentioned as a serious reproach to Protestantism, *e. g.*, Burnet's *Sermon*, 1703/4, p. 25.

[32] *Annual Sermon preached before the Society*, 1701/2, p. 17.

[33] Correspondence of Dellius in S. P. G. Letters Received, *passim*, *e. g.*, A I., nos. 7, 72, 89, 132; Journal, June 18, October 15, 1703; June 16, 1704.

[34] Sir William Ashurst to the secretary, June 30, 1703, Letters Received, A I., no. 92.

[35] Moor's letters in Letters Received, A II., nos. 75, 122. *Cf.* Bishop Burnet's anniversary *Sermon*, 1703/4, p. 20: "Our Designs upon Aliens and Infidels must begin in the Instructing and Reforming our own People." *Cf.* Journal, September 17, 1703.

[36] S. P. G. Journal, June 18, 1703. *Cf.* Marston to Bray, February 2, 1702/3; letters of S. Thomas in Letters Received, A I., nos. 83, 86.

the self-sacrificing and adventurous French Jesuits. Perhaps the practical temper of the English missionary was repelled by the slightness of the results in proportion to the energy expended. Caleb Heathcote, one of the most zealous of the Anglican laymen in New York, pointed out the necessity of sending men who could emulate the French in readiness to bear the hardships of life with the Indians "according to their way and manner". He thought Scotsmen better qualified for such service than Englishmen, but in general believed that the society could spend its money more usefully in caring for those who called themselves Christians.[37] Though as a result of this general attitude, the substantial work of the society was confined mainly to parochial work with the colonists and the Indians and negroes living among them, there was serious dissatisfaction in various quarters. Two South Carolina correspondents wrote to the society in 1705 condemning the South Carolina missionary who had neglected the service assigned him among the Yemassee Indians. They urged that missionaries must not be a "nice delicate sort of People", and dwelt in contrast upon the successful labors of the Spanish friars on the Florida frontier.[38] Robert Livingston, secretary of Indian affairs at Albany, was similarly disappointed by the failure of the Iroquois mission, of which he had been one of the chief advocates.[39]

It must be conceded that the political motive for Indian missions, especially among the Iroquois, was almost if not quite as influential as the religious. In 1704 the secretary of the society, in a letter to the Board of Trade announcing the selection of missionaries for this service, remarked that it was done "in consequence of the representation" made by the board to the queen, and that it did "at least as much concerne the State as the Church".[40] The continuance of the French war and the well-known visit of the Mohawk Indians to London naturally accentuated this political view of the Indian missions. In 1710 Secretary Sunderland wrote a somewhat peremptory letter to the archbishop transmitting an appeal from the visiting sachems on which the society was to report to the queen "without loss of time".[41] It was again pointed out in support of

[37] S. P. G. Letters Received, A II., no. 117.

[38] *Ibid.*, no. 156.

[39] Livingston to the secretary. *Ibid.*, no. 136. *Cf.* S. P. G. Journal, September 17, November 19, 1703, and app. A, no. 29.

[40] *Docs. rel. to the Col. Hist. of New York*, IV. 1077. *Cf.* representations of the board in *Acts of Privy Council, Colonial*, vol. II., no. 898; S. P. G. Journal, April 16, 1703.

[41] S. P. G. Letters Received, A V., nos. 85, 86, 88.

this appeal that delay might be a "point of ill-consequence" not only "of Religion but of State also".[42]

Partly at least as a result of this political pressure, the society reconsidered its whole policy regarding the relative importance of the two main divisions of its work. In the first of three notable resolutions adopted in 1710, it was declared that the design of the organization "dos chiefly and principally relate to the conversion of Heathen and Infidels", a work which was to be prosecuted "preferably to all others". The second resolution proposed the immediate resumption of the Iroquois mission, and the third declared that no more missionaries should be sent among Christians, except to fill vacant positions, until the prior claims of the heathen had been provided for.[43] An elaborate plan for the Iroquois mission was accordingly adopted[44] and a missionary was sent out in 1712. He also failed, however, and in 1719 the mission was suspended.[45]

The comparative ill success of these efforts to serve the Indians naturally strengthened the general conviction of the missionaries that their first duty was to their own misguided countrymen. The "children must first be satisfied and the lost Sheep recovered who have gone astray among hereticks and Quakers".[46]

Assuming that missionary service was to be concerned largely with the recovery of dissenters to the Anglican fold, there was room for much divergence of opinion as to the best means for securing the desired results. Some thought that sound churchmanship was to be promoted by associating with it certain special privileges. Lewis Morris, for instance, suggested in 1701 that no one be appointed governor unless he were a firm churchman and that if possible the

[42] Nicholson to the Archbishop of Canterbury, May 22, 1710. *Ibid.*, no. 94.

[43] S. P. G. Journal, April 21, 1710. *Cf.* anniversary *Sermon* of the Bishop of Norwich, 1709/10, urging conciliatory methods of correcting the errors of Christians in order through the example of the latter to bring the "Native Infidels" into the fold. "For this is what they are always to look on as their principal Business, and that for which this Corporation was primarily erected" (pp. 16–20).

[44] *Ibid.*, April 28, 1710. *Cf.* the *Abstract*, for 1710/11, p. 38.

[45] Pascoe, *Two Hundred Years of the S. P. G.*, pp. 70–71. *Cf. Abstracts*, 1712/13, pp. 60–62; 1713/14, pp. 46–49. Humphreys in his *Historical Account* (1730) assumes that the obstacles to missionary work among the Iroquois were insuperable (ch. XI.).

[46] S. P. G. Letters Received, A II., no. 22. It must not be forgotten, however, that considerable attention was given to the Christianizing of negroes. The subject was urged upon the attention of missionaries and some conscientious work was done by them. *Cf.* the summary in Humphreys's *Historical Account*, ch. X. An estimate of the work is given by M. W. Jernegan in a paper on "Christianity and Slavery in the American Colonies", read at the meeting of the American Historical Association in Charleston, December 29, 1913 [and to be printed before long in this journal].

same test be applied to councillors and magistrates. In general, churchmen should have "peculiar Privileges above others", preferably by act of Parliament.[47] In 1705 the colonial clergy assembled at Burlington suggested in a similar spirit that the exclusion from certain offices of those who failed to "Frequent the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper" might be a good way of weakening the schism.[48] The general principle had just been applied in the well-known South Carolina law imposing a sacramental test for membership in the assembly, which was subsequently repealed through the intervention of the crown. Ill adapted as these proposals were to American conditions, they came naturally enough from a generation which was already accustomed to the English Test and Corporation acts and was soon to see the enactment of the Occasional Conformity Bill and the Schism Act.

Some missionaries advocated more conciliatory methods and were even ready to take liberties with the rubric in order to disarm Puritan prejudices. For instance, a missionary on Long Island thought it necessary to modify the baptismal service, which he found would "not go down by any means in the strictness of our Liturgy". "I hope", he added, that "my Diocesan and the Honorable Society will not blame me in this so necessary a Condescension, in adding a word or two to soften that wch grates (as they say) upon tender consciences". No man was more naturally inclined than himself to observe the "Strictest Rules of the Rubrick", "but a part of St. Paul's pious Guile will sooner captivate these tempers than either the allurements of fair promises or the force of threats".[49] In 1708 Bishop Burnet was consulted on the same subject by Commissary Johnston of South Carolina, who observed that some of the clergy in his jurisdiction had been accustomed to give way to the extent of baptizing children without godparents and without the sign of the Cross. He was sure that Burnet would "say all that can be said on this argument; which is whether any of the Ceremonys [of] our Church may be dispensed, in order to preserve and retain those that are in communion with us already, tho' not such full Conformists as may be Wish'd for, and to gain those that do separate from us on the account of some Ceremonies and are actually joined and linked with the Dissenters".[50]

There was, however, a militant group, of whom John Talbot was perhaps the most conspicuous, who were so aggressive as to call

[47] Morris's "Memorial" in S. P. G. Journal, app. B, no. 1.
[48] S. P. G. Journal, app. A, no. 84.
[49] John Thomas, 1705, S. P. G. Letters Received, A II., no. 102.
[50] *Ibid.*, A IV., no. 97.

forth protests even from Anglican officials. Governor Robert Hunter of New York and New Jersey was a vigorous supporter of authority in government and emphatic in his profession of loyalty to the Church of England as the "most pure and best constituted church upon earth"; he was also a subscriber to the society's funds. Nevertheless he thought there were fanatics in the church as well as out of it and that they were largely responsible for the political animosities in his neighborhood. He therefore repeatedly urged the society to send out a general letter to the missionaries advising them to be more cautious in their attitude "toward those of different Persuasions as to Ceremonial or Church Discipline".[51]

Some of the leading members of the society including the Archbishop of Canterbury himself sympathized, in a measure at least, with Hunter's view. Many of the bishops and some other church dignitaries had Whig affiliations and were not disposed to antagonize the dissenters unnecessarily. On one occasion the archbishop objected to the appointment of a certain missionary because of his pamphlet controversy with the Puritans, in which, Tenison thought, there was "too much bitterness for the Spirit of a Missionary".[52] At any rate the missionaries were cautioned as Hunter proposed and the Bishop of London agreed to use his influence with Talbot. To that sturdy fighter, Talbot, this prudent council seemed nothing less than a Laodicean plea for "moderation in religion" from men who lived "at home at ease and plenty", knowing little of colonial conditions and of the "damnable heresies" that flourished there. Toleration of such errors was "worse than the worst persecution in the World, for that only destroys men's bodys, but these destroy body and soul in Hell forever".[53]

In the main, however, the difference between Talbot and his more conciliatory associates and superiors was one of method rather than of principle. Both undoubtedly regarded the reclaiming of dis-

[51] Letters of Hunter to the secretary of the society, February 21 to March 21, 1709/10, Letters Received, A V., nos. 70–73, 80. *Cf.* Journal, March 17, 1709/10; April 21, 1710.

[52] Archbishop to the secretary, May 19, 1709/10. Letters Received, A V., no. 91; Journal, April 21, 1710. The Bishop of Norwich in his anniversary *Sermon* of 1709/10 warns against divisions in the society: "And to this end the Christianity given them to preach, should be kept as near as is possible to the Simplicity of the Gospel; and as free as may be from those Disputes which have been to the Hindrance of it. If all cannot be avoided by Reason of the Differences that are already on Foot among the Christians that live in those Parts, yet Care should be taken not to increase them; To be sure not to send any new Notions or Questions among them; which ought at least to be kept on this Side of the Water, if they cannot wholly be laid." *Sermon*, 1709/10, pp. 17–18.

[53] Talbot to the secretary, S. P. G. Letters Received, A V., no. 19.

senters as an important part of the missionary service.[54] The planting of Anglican churches in Puritan communities was held to be justified not simply because of doctrinal differences, but partly at least on the ground that many people in such communities failed to share in the fundamental sacraments of the Christian Church. In the correspondence of Caleb Heathcote, the New York politician, this point was urged as one of the chief reasons for the extension of the Anglican work to Connecticut. He maintained that the refusal of the Congregational ministers to baptize any children except those whose parents were in full communion left "many thousands in that Government unbaptized". In a subsequent letter he declared that in some of the Connecticut towns, less than one tenth of the "sober people" were "admitted to the sacrament". It seemed to him that those who "stop and hedge up the way to God's altar" would have much to answer for. From the Anglican point of view, which steadily emphasized the sacramental aspects of religion, such criticism was natural enough; for the Puritan theory conceived of the church as a carefully selected group of true believers, insisting on tests which limited membership and participation in the sacraments to a comparatively small part of the community.[55]

An interesting feature of the missionary correspondence related to Harvard College, whose importance as a training place for Puritan ministers was fully recognized. It was hoped, however, that instead of poisoning the minds of New England youth with the errors of Independency, Harvard might be converted into a centre of Anglican influence. In 1703 George Keith suggested that some "pious and able scholars" might be sent thither from Oxford and Cambridge to make disciples in the American Cambridge, who should in their turn gradually reclaim New England from its evil ways.[56] Nothing tangible came of this proposal, but it is an interesting anticipation of Timothy Cutler's defection from Congregational principles at Yale, twenty years later, and his subsequent efforts to secure the admission of the Anglican clergy of Boston to the Harvard Board of Overseers. Meantime, high hopes were entertained of persuading

[54] Cotton Mather complained in 1715 that the S. P. G. neglected many colonies "in the most paganizing Circumstances", sending their missionaries instead to towns where they could only serve as "Tools of Contention" and where "the meanest Christians understand Religion and practise it, better than the Ministers whom they send over to us". Mass. Hist. Soc. *Collections*, seventh series, VIII. 327.

[55] Heathcote's letters, 1706, 1710, in S. P. G. Letters Received, A II., no. 165; A V., no. 84.

[56] Keith to Bray, February 26, 1702/3; *ibid.*, A I., no. 86. Cf. Talbot to the secretary, *ibid.*, no. 181.

many Harvard graduates to accept Anglican orders if only a resident bishop could be provided to give them ordination.[57]

As against the Quakers, the missionaries felt that they had an even stronger case. Talbot characterized them as "Anti-Christians who are worse than Turks" and if "let alone will increase to an abominable desolacion".[58] This intense feeling was due to a variety of causes. Something must be allowed for the influence of Keith's own experience as a recent convert from Quakerism, and the situation was complicated by the political objection to Quaker views on oaths and military service and their supposedly anarchical tendencies.[59] The very efficiency of their propaganda, on which Keith, especially, laid great stress, naturally increased the feeling against them.[60] Even a fragmentary reading of the Friends' records will show how thoroughly the London Yearly Meeting kept up its communications with the scattered Quaker communities in North America and the West Indies.[61] Their organization seems simple enough when compared with that of the Church of England, but it was indefatigable in the dissemination of literature and in the inspiring of volunteer missionaries for whom no journey was too difficult. Nor were they without influence in the imperial administration. Penn's position is well known, but it must not be forgotten that there were many other Friends among the well-to-do merchants of London whose standing as commercial experts gave them a decided advantage in pleading before the Board of Trade the cause of their brethren in the colonies who refused to pay "priest's rates" at the bidding of Anglican or Puritan authorities.[62] Indeed the Quaker "lobby" in London, if we may use a modern term, seemed at times quite able to hold its own even against the prelates of the national church.

Finally there was in the case of Quakerism, as well as in that of the Puritans, a fundamental question of principle, which helps to ex-

[57] Heathcote to the society, *ibid.*, II., no. 117; Christopher Bridge to the secretary, October 7, 1706, *ibid.*, A III., no. 2; Memorial of S. Thomas, 1705, in S. P. G. Journal, app. A, no. 74. *Cf.* Quincy, *Hist. of Harvard Univ.*, I. 360–376, 560–574; Perry, *Hist. Coll. rel. to Amer. Col. Church*, III. 210 ff.

[58] S. P. G. Letters Received, A III., no. 186.

[59] The official attitude is illustrated by a representation of the Committee of Trade in 1694. *Acts of Privy Council, Colonial*, vol. II., no. 539. See Root, *The Relations of Pennsylvania with the British Government*, chs. VIII., IX., for a thorough treatment of political and legal issues.

[60] Keith *et als.*, Account of the State, etc., S. P. G. Journal, app. B, no. 24. Keith to Bray, February 24, 1702/3, in S. P. G. Letters Received, A I., no. 87.

[61] Series of Epistles Received, Epistles Sent, in Friends' Historical Library, Devonshire House, London.

[62] For typical procedure in such matters (1702), see London "Meeting for Sufferings", Minutes, XVI. 21–163, *passim*. *Cf.* Board of Trade Journal, September 3, 1702; January 25, 1702/3.

plain the intensity of ecclesiastical partizanship. Even more than the Puritan, the Quaker seemed to depart from the fundamental teachings of Christianity as understood by nearly all who in that age called themselves Christians at all. Some of their leaders, including Penn himself, were believed to be heterodox on the question of the Trinity;[63] and their doctrine of the "inner light", coupled with their indifference to the Christian sacraments, may well have seemed to be a mere cloak for irreligion. To a clergyman who conceived of the administration of the sacraments as the most sacred function of his office, the Quaker attitude was indeed a denial of the faith.[64]

Less prominent than the Puritans of Congregational or Presbyterian associations, and the Quakers, but still numerous enough to attract the attention of the missionaries, were the Baptists. They were most conspicuous in Rhode Island, but were by no means confined to that colony. In New Jersey, Lewis Morris was afraid that many of the new converts might be drawn away because of the encouragement given to the Anabaptist preachers by Andrew Browne, one of the councillors of that province.[65] In Pennsylvania, Keith had a public debate with a Baptist champion named Killingsworth, who had been summoned by his partizans for this purpose. The dispute lasted four hours, and as usual Keith believed that his arguments had been efficacious.[66] The Baptists were also to be found in the South. They are mentioned from time to time in the reports on several South Carolina parishes and in one parish they were said to form a majority of the dissenting inhabitants, with a preacher who

[63] Talbot writes: "It appears by Wm. Penn's Book that he is a greater Anti-Christ than Julian the Apostate." He credits Penn with saying that "Christ is a finite Impotent Creature". S. P. G. Letters Received, A I., no. 119.

[64] The view of contemporary English churchmen on this subject is well illustrated by the petition of the London clergy against the Quakers' Affirmation Bill of 1722, protesting against further concessions "by a Christian legislature to a set of men who renounce the divine institutions of Christ, particularly that by which the faithful are initiated into his religion and denominated Christians, and who cannot on this account, according to the uniform judgment, and practice of the Catholic church, be deemed worthy of that sacred name". On the passage of the bill, several peers, spiritual and temporal, signed a protest referring to the Quakers as rejecting "the two sacraments of Christ" and consequently "as far as they so do, unworthy of the name of Christians". The protestants went on to express their opinion that "the Quakers, as they renounce the institutions of Christ, so have not given even the evidence by law required of their belief in his divinity". *Parliamentary History*, VII. 937–948. *Cf.* Barclay, *An Apology for the True Christian Divinity* (tenth ed., London, 1841), chs. XII., XIII., for a good statement of the Quaker view that the formal observance of the sacraments was unnecessary. "For", he says, "we certainly know that the day is dawned in which God hath arisen and hath dismissed all those ceremonies and rites, and is only to be *worshipped in spirit*."

[65] S. P. G. Letters Received, A I., no. 171.

[66] *Ibid.*, no. 87.

visited them every third Sunday. One such minister is mentioned as having lately arrived from the Devonshire town of Bideford.[67] Sometimes a missionary wrote home for literature in defense of infant baptism, and in 1705 the society at the instance of the Bishop of London considered a request from Chief Justice Trott of South Carolina, himself something of an expert in divinity, for the printing of five hundred copies of "John Philpot's Letter agst the Anabaptists". The matter was referred to a committee of which Archdeacon White Kennett, afterwards bishop of Peterborough, was a member. On their recommendation the letter was ordered to be printed accordingly, with extracts from the works of Bishop Stillingfleet.[68]

A somewhat different problem which confronted the Venerable Society and its missionaries was that of the foreign Protestants who were beginning to assume importance both at home and in the colonies. Here again ecclesiastical and political interests were clearly associated and the Church of England was felt to be a possible means of nationalizing the non-English stocks. It must be remembered in this connection that many churchmen even among the High Church party were disposed to differentiate quite sharply the Reformed churches of the Continent from the corresponding denominations in England which had refused to accept the authority of the national church. The latter were dissenters from a system which represented a preponderant opinion and had the support of the state. On the other hand the Lutherans and Calvinists of the Continent were conceded, by many Anglicans at least, a certain degree of legitimacy as the representatives of non-Roman Christianity in their respective countries.[69]

The letter-books of the society contain a considerable amount of correspondence with Continental clergy of the Reformed churches which in its distinctly irenic tone is fairly representative of an important section of Anglican opinion. Several of these foreign Protestants were elected members of the society, among them M. Bonet, the Prussian envoy in London, who served in 1709 on a committee to

[67] Report by S. Thomas in S. P. G. Journal, app. A, no. 79; Letters Received, A IV., nos. 111, 141, A V., no. 133.

[68] S. P. G. Letters Received, A V., no. 133; S. P. G. Journal, March 30, April 20, 1705.

[69] *Cf.* Overton, *Life in the English Church, 1660–1714*, pp. 348–351. The anniversary sermons in general show strong Protestant feeling. See the cordial references to the foreign Protestant members of the society in the Bishop of Norwich's *Sermon*, 1709/10, pp. 18, 22, and in the attached *Abstract*, p. 37. *Cf. Abstract* for 1712/3: "The Society have inlarg'd their correspondence in Foreign Courts and Universities, to communicate freely their Christian Designs, and to excite a Spirit of Zeal and Emulation in other Protestant States and Princes."

examine a candidate for missionary service among the German colonists.[70] There was an especially sympathetic attitude toward the French Protestant churches in England, whether, as in some instances, they accepted Anglican orders, or retained their own discipline.[71] With the great influx of Palatine Germans, however, a reaction set in and the Tory, High Church party displayed a strong antipathy toward the foreign immigrants.

In the missionary correspondence of this period three non-English elements figure most prominently: the French Huguenots, the Dutch, and the Germans. The French Huguenots presented on the whole the least difficulty. They were not massed in any one colony or group of colonies, but dispersed along the Atlantic seaboard from New England to South Carolina, where they played a more important part than in any other colony. In the French congregations the Calvinistic practice was at first generally maintained, but their relations with the Anglican element were usually amicable, notably so in South Carolina where these two groups acted together for some purposes against the English dissenters. Gideon Johnston, the commissary in South Carolina, reported that the French minister at Charleston had "greatly distinguished himself in favor of the Church of England against the dissenting ministers", and would "willingly receive Episcopal ordination", if he could conveniently go to England.[72] Efforts were made with some success to induce ministers and congregations to conform to the Anglican system, and in some cases the S. P. G. was willing to make grants of money on condition of such conformity. In Boston a French minister, whose ordination was regular, was nevertheless refused a subsidy because his congregation was not "conformable to the Church of England".[73] In 1706 the French minister at New Rochelle, in New York, was refused a regular allowance unless he and his congregation would use the English liturgy. Three years later this condition was complied with, though not without some friction.[74] To facilitate the change from the Reformed to the Anglican service the society interested itself in providing prayer-books in French and English.[75]

[70] S. P. G. Journal, I., *passim. e. g.*, December 17, 1708; December 16, 1709; March 3, 1709/10; also S. P. G. Letters Received, *passim.*

[71] *Cf.* Allen and McClure, *History of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge*, pp. 19–21.

[72] S. P. G. Letters Received, A V., no. 158.

[73] S. P. G. Journal, March 21, 1706/7; Letters Received, A III., nos. 3, 4, 9.

[74] S. P. G. Journal, May 17, 1706; June 3, 1709; Letters Received, A IV., no. 155; A V., nos. 2, 135.

[75] Journal, November 18, December 2, 1709. *Cf.* annual *Sermon* and *Abstract* of 1710/11, p. 37, which notes the sending of "English and French Common Prayer Books to Carolina, New York, etc. this and the last year".

The problem of the Dutch in New York and New Jersey was more difficult. It was maintained by some that the fusion of Dutch and English elements should be promoted by gradually eliminating the Dutch ministers and substituting Anglican clergy. The notorious Lord Cornbury proposed that, as the Dutch ministers died, their places should be filled with English ministers; and one of the missionaries quoted him as saying that even "without a command, if the Queen would only give him leave he would never suffer another Dutch minister to come in". Without such drastic measures he despaired of making New York a truly English colony.[76] Cornbury's view did not prevail, however, and more moderate measures were adopted. In 1704 Lewis Morris urged that a "vast service" would be done if a Dutchman, or at least someone acquainted with the Dutch language could be sent as a missionary to New York with a "Parcell of Dutch Common Prayer Books to give away",[77] and this policy was actually pursued to a limited extent, as in the case of the French. In 1710 a Dutch clergyman, after being duly ordained by the Bishop of London, was appointed missionary to Harlem with the usual allowance from the society;[78] and there are frequent votes in the Journal for the sending out of Dutch prayer-books.[79] A little later Morris reported that the new missionary was gaining ground at Harlem, and that there were already "several Strenuous Dutch advocates for the Church", though he agreed that substantial progress would "be a work of time".[80]

The spiritual care of the German immigrants became a matter of serious concern to the society in 1709. Even a year earlier the Board of Trade had before it an application from Joshua von Kocherthal for a salary to be settled upon him on his arrival in New York, and there was some doubt as to a precedent for such a grant to a foreign clergyman.[81] In May, 1709, a committee of the society reported on a proposal recently received that a German minister be sent out with the Palatines. The committee suggested that if

[76] T. Moor to the secretary, November 13, 1705, in S. P. G. Letters Received, A II., no. 122; Cornbury to the same, November 22, 1705, *ibid.*, no. 131.

[77] *Ibid.*, A I., no. 171.

[78] Journal, December 16, 30, 1709; January 20, February 3, 10, 1709/10; Letters Received, A V., no. 143.

[79] Journal, March 28, 1706; November, December, 1709; April 28, 1710. The *Abstract* for 1710/11 (pp. 37–38) notes the printing of 750 copies of the liturgy in "English and Low Dutch".

[80] Letters Received, A V., no. 143. The mission was withdrawn in 1713. Pascoe, *Two Hundred Years of the S. P. G.*, p. 61.

[81] Board of Trade Journal, July 8, 1708. Kocherthal was afterwards voted £20 by the society, though his failure to secure Episcopal ordination prevented his being adopted as a regular missionary.

no suitable person could be found in England, application might be made to "Professor Frank at Hall in Germany".[82] After conference with the Bishop of London and the Archbishop of Canterbury, action was postponed until the government had decided what was to be done about the transportation of refugees to America. In December the subject was reopened and La Mothe, a French refugee minister, was requested, with one other member, to select a suitable person for the service. A few weeks later, the society after hearing from the committee voted to appoint John Frederic Hager, a German minister who had presented satisfactory testimonials, provided he would accept Episcopal ordination and qualify under the usual rules for the missionary service. These conditions were complied with and in a few months Hager began his service in New York.[83]

The new minister had, however, a complex situation to deal with, partly because the German Protestants were themselves divided into Calvinistic and Lutheran factions. Though Hager reported a considerable number of German communicants, they seem to have acted under some sense of compulsion. The Lutheran minister was said to have urged his people to "stick to that in which they were bred and born", and Hager's efforts to compel their conformity were discouraged even by so good a churchman as Morris. The Calvinists, thereupon, began to ask, "If the Lutherans are not obliged to conform, why should we?"[84] Thus with the Germans as with the Dutch, the difficulties were great and the results inconsiderable. As is well known, the Palatines were not happy in New York and the main stream of German immigration was deflected to Pennsylvania, where they were left to work out their own salvation with less interference.

The vigorous competition of all these rival churches brought out

[82] The distinguished pietist theologian, Francke, is doubtless referred to here. *Cf.* Allen and McClure, *History of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge*, p. 21.

[83] S. P. G. Journal, May 20, June 3, December 2, 16, 30, 1709; S. P. G. Letters Received, A V., no. 143. The annual *Abstract* of 1710/11 (p. 38) records the appointment of a minister among the "Poor Palatines" of New York and declares the intention of the society to "give them a whole Impression of our Liturgy in the High Dutch or German Tongue, which as they are inform'd from thence, is like to be a happy Expedient of uniting both Lutherans and Calvinists and bringing them all over to the Church of England".

[84] Hager to the secretary, S. P. G. Letters Received, A VI., nos. 21, 44; Lewis Morris to the secretary, *ibid.*, A V., no. 143. Kocherthal wrote from New York in November, 1710, that he had sounded the Lutheran Palatines as to their possible union with the Church of England "in ceremonialibus", adding, "finde aber das es bey den meisten sehr hart solte hergehen; nichtsdestoweniger hoffe ich nach und nach sie dahin zu persuadiren". *Ibid.*, VI., no. 45.

clearly the weakness of the Anglican organization on the colonial side. In characteristic and picturesque language, John Talbot put his finger on the weak point. "The Presbyterians", he said, "come a long way to lay hands on one another. . . . The Independents are called by their Sovereign Lord the People. The Anabaptists and Quakers pretend to the Spirit. But the poor Church has nobody on the spot to comfort or confirm her children. Nobody to ordain several that are willing to serve were they ordained for the work of the ministry."[85] In short the Anglican Church in America was trying to operate a system in which the episcopal function was essential, with no bishop nearer than three thousand miles away. Confirmation was the normal condition of full communion and ordination was essential to the full exercise of the clerical function, yet neither confirmation nor ordination could be exercised by any one in America.[86]

The discipline of the clergy presented another serious difficulty. The lack of a competent ecclesiastical jurisdiction for this purpose naturally led colonial governors and assemblies into the institution of other methods which, from an Anglican point of view, were decidedly irregular. In South Carolina, for example, even the zealous church party became involved in a controversy with the Bishop of London on this question. Royal governors and other imperial officials, however sound their churchmanship might be, were hardly competent supervisors of the clergy; but the society felt obliged to use them in this capacity. The missionaries, thus subjected, as one of them truly said, "to the various humors of different overseers", were tempted "to be Parasites, fawn, and stroke that which may hurt us".[87] Some of the most serious conflicts of the colonial clergy were with men like Nicholson, Cornbury, and Quary, who had acquired prestige as zealous supporters of the church.[88]

[85] Letter of September 1, 1703, in S. P. G. Letters Received, A I.

[86] *Cf.* a letter from J. Bass of New Jersey to the secretary, September 2, 1709, in which he refers specifically to the difficulty arising from the rubric requiring confirmation before communion. *Ibid.*, A V., no. 43.

[87] J. Thomas to Hodges, April 30, 1709, in *ibid.*, A V., no. 17.

[88] The difficulties between Governor Nicholson of Virginia and James Blair are well known. Cornbury was at first in high favor with the missionaries, but as one of them wrote later, "Tempora mutantur", and his harsh treatment of the New Jersey clergymen was used to prove the need of a resident bishop. *Ibid.*, A III., no. 168. Quary complained of the factious attitude of "these Young Gentlemen of the Clergy" who desired to "govern as they please without the least control". Quary's feelings were evidently reciprocated, for one of the clergy wrote that he lacked "time to set forth the sinister ends of this person to which he would make the Church and the Ministers subservient, of whom he always endeavored to form a party to joyn him in his representation of himself and the establishment of his character at home", Thomas Jenkins to the secretary, March 23, 1708. *Ibid.*, A IV., no. 110.

The missionaries on the ground and the society at home were substantially agreed as to the need of a resident bishop. Undoubtedly the proposal had important political bearings. It was urged by some of its promoters that an American bishop would help to support authority against factious elements in the colonial governments, and the close relation between the Anglican clergy and the leaders of the imperialistic party is a well-known fact of colonial politics.[89] The experience of many Englishmen who had come to America had undoubtedly been such as to suggest that an American bishop once securely established would hardly content himself with the spiritual care of his own flock. As White Kennett said in a letter to Colman in 1713, there was "so much of an *Ecclesiastical* and of a *Civil* Nature in this Affair" as to make the solution extremely difficult. Nevertheless the hearty support given to the measure by liberal churchmen like Kennett and Tenison indicates that the genuinely religious motive deserves more emphasis than has commonly been allowed by students of American history. The plan cannot fairly be set down as a purely Tory proposition.[90]

In order to disarm possible opponents, it was suggested by Bishop Compton and others that instead of appointing at the outset a bishop of full rank, a suffragan bishop might be sent out with delegated authority to perform such functions as confirmation and ordination, but without the full powers of an English diocesan.[91] The whole subject was seriously considered by a committee of the society in 1703 and the Journal contains numerous references to the subject during the next ten years.[92] There were legal difficulties in the way which delayed action but in 1707 Archbishop Tenison reported that he had laid the matter before the queen, and that she had asked him to prepare a plan.[93] Two years later the matter was again discussed at a meeting attended by the archbishop himself; and in 1710 the society took advantage of public interest in the Iroquois mission to point out the difficulty of administering such work without a bishop.[94] Finally, in the last years of Queen Anne's reign, the plan of an American episcopate seemed likely to come in

[89] Address of clergy at Burlington, N. J., November 2, 1705, in S. P. G. Journal, app. A, no. 84.

[90] *Cf.* Cross, *Anglican Episcopate*, pp. 93–99, especially 99, notes. See also chs. VII., VIII.

[91] *Ibid.*, app. A, no. III., pp. 277–278.

[92] *E. g.*, April 16, 1703; November 17, December 15, 1704; December, 1706–October, 1707, *passim*; app. A, no. 50.

[93] *Ibid.*, September 19, 1707.

[94] The annual *Abstract* for 1710/11 reports (p. 36) that the matter is "yet depending before the Society" and that in the meantime Gov. Hunter was authorized to treat for the purchase of a bishop's house at Burlington.

with the rising tide of High Church influence in the national councils. In 1713 it was expected that a bill would be presented to Parliament authorizing the creation of the new bishoprics.[95] The next year, however, Queen Anne died, the Tories went out of office, and the opportunity for establishing an effective organization of the colonial church was indefinitely postponed.[96]

Just what would have been the effect of extending the diocesan system to the colonies, half a century before the economic and political controversies of the Revolutionary era, it is, of course, quite impossible to say. The work of the Venerable Society went on and substantial results were accomplished. Nevertheless it can hardly be doubted that the establishment of the national church, in anything like its full vigor, on American soil would have strengthened materially the influence of traditional and conservative ideals. The comparative weakness of the Anglican Church was significant, not merely because its clergy were advocates of certain political theories;[97] but perhaps even more because their whole system of worship and discipline emphasized the importance for each new generation of the inherited elements in civilization, or, to use Burke's phrase again, the "early received and uniformly continued sense of mankind". A lessened sense of the dignity and value of this continuous tradition, attaching the new-world life to its roots in the old, was surely one important element in that differentiation of American from European society which found political expression in a new nationality.

EVARTS B. GREENE.

[95] An address by the society to the queen recommended four colonial bishops. *Ibid.*, 1713/14, p. 39.

[96] See Cross, *Anglican Episcopate*, pp. 100, 101, in which the controversies resulting from the later revival of the plan are fully discussed. There are still hopeful references to the project in the annual *Abstracts* of 1714/15 (pp. 52–55) and 1715/16 (pp. 21–22). The latter records Archbishop Tenison's bequest of £1000 "toward the Settlement of Two Bishops, one for the Continent, the other for the Isles of America".

[97] *Cf.* Van Tyne, "Influence of the Clergy, and of Religious and Sectarian Forces on the American Revolution", in AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, XIX. 44–64 (1913).

THE CREATIVE FORCES IN WESTWARD EXPANSION: HENDERSON AND BOONE[1]

As focus of the old West, Kentucky has always loomed large in the national imagination as the habitat of the American border hero. Boone and Kenton, Harrod and Clark, Callaway and Logan, lurk vast in the wings of the national theatre, dramatic protagonists magnified to almost superhuman proportions in the mist of a legendary past. About them floats the aureole of traditional romance. Wrought with rude but masterly strength out of the hardships and vicissitudes of pioneer life, the heroic conquest of the wilderness, the mortal struggles of border warfare, this composite figure of Indian fighter, crafty backwoodsman, and crude surveyor has emerged as the type-figure in the romance of the evolution of American character. This model, with its invincible fascination and predominantly heroic attributes, has overshadowed and obscured the less spectacular yet more fecund instrumentalities in the colonization and civilization of the West. To-day, in the clarifying light of contemporary research, illuminating social and economic forces, the creative and formative causes of colonization and expansion, the individual merges into the group; and the isolated effort assumes its true character as merely a single factor in social evolution. We have come to recognize that the man of genius obeys a movement quite as much as he controls it, and even more than he creates it. In the pitiless perspective of historic evolution, the spectacular hero at first sight seems to lessen; but the mass, the movement, the social force which he epitomizes and interprets, gain in impressiveness and dignity.[2]

The hero of the pioneer West, Daniel Boone, has played the lofty rôle of exemplar of the leadership of the *hinterland* movement of the eighteenth century. At the hands of that inaccurate and turgid amanuensis, John Filson, Boone has been apotheosized, in approved Scriptural fashion, as the instrument of Providence, ordained by God to settle the wilderness. Nor is this superstitious delusion confined to Filson. "An over-ruling Providence", says Boone, in speaking of himself, "seems to have watched over his life, and preserved

[1] A paper read at the meeting of the American Historical Association at Charleston, December 30, 1913.

[2] *Cf.* Henderson, "The Beginnings of American Expansion", *North Carolina Review*, September and October, 1910.

him to be the humble instrument in settling one of the fairest portions of the new world."[3] Fancy has played erratically about this sane and simple figure, envisaging him in countless disguises, from the primitive man returning to nature (after Rousseau) to the genius of modern communism (after Spencer). At the hands of the earlier biographers, Boone has taken on the hue and tone of an unsocial and primitive figure, as unreal as an Indian from the pages of Chateaubriand, perpetually fleeing from civilization in response to the lure of the forest and the irresistible call of the wild. At the hands of later biographers, Boone is fantastically endowed with the creative imagination of the colonizer and the civic genius of a founder of states. In the face of such disparities of romantic distortion, wrought upon the character and rôle of Boone, the true significance of the westward expansionist movement suffers obscuration and eclipse. Scientifically historic investigation must relegate to the superstitious and the gullible, to the panegyrist and the hero-worshipper, the providential interpretation of our national history.

Meantime, there remains to narrate the just and authentic story of westward expansion, and to project the true picture of Boone as the typical figure of the expert backwoodsman in the westward migration of the peoples. Only thus shall we secure the correct perspective for the social, political, and economic history of the colonization of the West. Such a recital must unmask the forces behind Boone, the chain of social causation, the truly creative forces in the expansionist movement. In such a recital, Boone is shorn of none of those remarkable powers as explorer, scout, pathfinder, landlooker, and individual Indian fighter which have given him a secure niche in the hall of national fame. It involves the recognition, nevertheless, that his genius was essentially individual rather than social, unique rather than communistic. In the larger social sense, it involves the further recognition that those of Boone's achievements which had the widest bearing on the future and ultimately effected national results were accomplished through his instrumentality, not in the rôle of originative genius and constructive colonizer, but in the rôle of pioneer and way-breaker. Boone's pioneering initiative and his familiarity with Indian temperament found the best field for their most effective display under the guidance of the constructive mind and colonizing genius of Henderson. Boone acted as the agent of men of commercial enterprise and far-seeing political imagination, intent upon an epochal politico-economic project of colonization, promotion, and expansion. Boone may have been the instrument of

[3] Memorial to the Legislature of Kentucky", January 18, 1812.

Providence, as he so piously imagined; but it is indubitable that he was the agent of commercial enterprise and colonial promotion.

I.

The exploration and colonization of the West, with the ultimate consequence of the acquisition of the trans-Alleghany region, was not the divinely appointed work of any single man. In reality, this consummation flowered out of two fundamental impulses in the life of the period, the creative causes of territorial expansion. Intensive analysis reveals the further cardinal fact that it was two racial streams, the one distinguished by unit-characters, individualistic, democratic, the other corporate in interests, communistic, with aristocratic attributes—their temporary co-ordination and subsequent sharp mutual reaction—which constituted the instrumentalities for the initial steps in the westward expansionist movement. The creative forces which inaugurated the territorial expansion of the American people westward found typical embodiment, the one in a great land company intent upon carving out a new colony, the other in the supreme pioneer and land-looker of his day.

The prime determinative principle of the progressive American civilization of the eighteenth century was the passion for the acquisition of land. After the peace of Aix-la-Chapelle (1748), which left the boundaries of France and England in America unsettled, Céloron de Bienville was despatched in the spring of 1749 to sow broadcast the seeds of empire, the leaden plates symbolic of the asserted sovereignty of France. Through a grant to the Ohio Company, organized in 1748 and composed of a number of the most prominent men of the day in Virginia, England proceeded to take possession without the formal assertion of her claims; and Christopher Gist, summoned from his remote home on the Yadkin in North Carolina, made a thorough reconnaissance of the western region in 1750–1751. Almost simultaneously, the Loyal Land Company of Virginia received a royal grant of eight hundred thousand acres, and in the spring of 1750 despatched Thomas Walker westward upon his now well-known tour of exploration.[4] The vast extent of uninhabited transmontane lands, of fabled beauty, richness, and fertility, excited dreams of grandiose possibilities in the minds of English and colonials alike. England was said to be "New Land mad and everybody there has his eye fixed on this Country".[5] To Franklin and Washington, to the Lees and Patrick Henry, to Lyman and Clark, the West

[4] J. S. Johnston, *First Explorations of Kentucky* (Filson Club Publications).
[5] Johnson MSS., XII., no. 127.

loomed large as the promised land—for settlement, for trade, for occupation—to men brave enough to risk their all in its acquisition. The royal proclamation of 1763 gave a new impetus to the colonizing spirit, dormant during the early years of the war, and marks the true beginning of Western colonization. The feeling of the period was succinctly interpreted by Washington, who, in describing the "rising empire" beyond the Alleghanies, denominates it "a tract of country which is unfolding to our view, the advantages of which are too great and too obvious, I should think, to become the subject of serious debate, but which, through ill-timed parsimony and supineness, may be wrested from us and conducted through other channels".[6]

The second determinative impulse of the pioneer civilization was *wanderlust*—the passionately inquisitive instinct of the hunter, the traveller, the explorer. A secondary object of the proclamation of 1763, according to Edmund Burke, was the limitation of the colonies on the West, as "the charters of many of our old colonies give them, with few exceptions, no bounds to the westward but the South Sea".[7] The Long Hunters taking their lives in their hands fared boldly forth to a fabled hunters' paradise in the far-away wilderness, because they were driven by the irresistible desire of a Ponce de Leon or a De Soto, a Stanley or a Peary, to discover the truth about the undiscovered lands beyond the mountains. The hunter was not only thrilled with the passion of the chase in a veritable paradise of game: he was intent upon collecting the furs and skins of wild animals for lucrative barter and sale in the centres of trade. Quick to make "tomahawk claims" and to assert "corn rights", the pioneer spied out the rich virgin lands for future location, there to be free from the vexatious insistence of the tax-gatherer. "The people at the back part of those [North Carolina and Virginia] and the neighboring Colonies", writes Dunmore to Hillsborough as late as 1772, "finding that grants are not to be obtained, do seat themselves without any formalities wherever they like best."[8] To exploit the land for his individual advantage, eventually to convert the wilderness to the inevitable uses and purposes of civilization: such was the mission of the pioneer. Acting-Governor Nelson of Virginia, referring in 1770 to the frontier settlements, significantly remarks: "Very little if any Quit Rents have been received for his majesty's use from that Quarter for some time past; for they [the settlers] say, that as His

[6] *Cf.* Hulbert, *Washington and the West.*

[7] *Annual Register*, 1763, p. 20.

[8] "State Paper Office, America, vol. 192, no. 7", is the reference attached to the transcript in the Virginia State Library, Aspinwall Collection, pp. 77–81. Presumably the modern reference to the original is, Public Record Office, C. O. 5: 989.

Majesty hath been pleased to withdraw his protection from them since 1763, they think themselves bound not to pay Quit Rents."[9] The axe and the surveyor's chain, along with the rifle and the hunting-knife, constituted the armorial bearings of the pioneer. Again, with individual as with corporation, with explorer as with landlord, land-hunger was the master-impulse of the era.

In a little hamlet in North Carolina in the middle years of the eighteenth century, these two determinative principles, the acquisitive and the inquisitive instincts, found a conjunction which may justly be termed prophetic. Here occurred the meeting of two streams of racial tendency. The exploratory passion of the pioneer, given directive force in the interest of commercial enterprise, prepared the way for the westward migration of the peoples. That irresistible Southern migration, which preceded and presaged the greater wandering of the peoples across the Alleghanies a quarter of a century later, brought a horde of pioneer settlers from the more thickly populated sections of Pennsylvania, and a group of gentlemen planters from the Old Dominion of Virginia, to the frontier colony of North Carolina—famed afar for her fertile farm lands, alluvial river bottoms, and rich hunting grounds. The migratory horde from Pennsylvania found ultimate lodgment for certain of its number in the frontier county of Rowan; the stream of gentlemen planters from Virginia came to rest in the more settled regions of Orange and Granville. From these two racial and social elements stem the fecund creative forces in westward expansion.[10]

II.

In the first half of the eighteenth century, Pennsylvania felt the impetus of civilization from the throngs of immigrants who flocked into the Neshaminy Valley, the Cumberland Valley, eastward to the Delaware, up the river to the Lehigh, and into the twilight zone

[9] Nelson to Hillsborough, October 18, 1770. Bancroft Transcripts, Library of Congress.

[10] In the history of this epochal movement there is one of the most singular of *lacunae*—a gap almost unprecedented in a period of American life so industriously studied. Close scrutiny of the Draper collection, generally presumed to be the court of last resort for the career of Boone, as well as of Draper's correspondence, reveals the significant fact that the voluminous records of Rowan, where Boone lived for a quarter of a century prior to his removal to Kentucky, eluded the watchful eye, if not the curiosity, of the indefatigable Draper. An intensive study of these county records, the Draper MSS., the Henderson, Burton, Hogg, Hart, and Benton papers, taken in conjunction with a wider research into the careers of Daniel Boone and Richard Henderson, made by the writer, effects a new distribution of perspective and affords a rational *exposé* of the early expansionist movement.

of uncertain title towards Maryland. "These bold and indigent strangers", says Logan, Penn's agent, in 1724, "gave as their excuse when challenged for titles that we had solicited for colonists and they had come accordingly."[11] Aside from these bold squatters, who asserted that "it was against the laws of God and nature that so much land should be idle while so many christians wanted it to work on and to raise their bread", came innumerable *bona fide* purchasers of land, fleeing from the traditional bonds of caste and aristocracy in England and Europe, from religious persecution and favoritism, to a haven of refuge, where they received guarantees of full tolerance in religious faith and the benefits of representative self-government. From East Devonshire in England came George, the grandfather of Daniel Boone, and from Wales came Edward Morgan, whose daughter Sarah married Squire, Daniel Boone's father—conspicuous representatives of the Society of Friends, drawn thither by the representations of the great Quaker, William Penn, with his advanced views on popular government and religious toleration.[12] Hither too came Morgan Bryan from Ireland, where he had gone from Denmark, settling in Chester County prior to 1719; and his children, William, James, and Morgan, the brothers-in-law of Daniel Boone, were intimately concerned in the subsequent westward migration.[13] In 1720 the vanguard of that great army of Ulster Scots, with their stern, rugged qualities of aggressive self-reliance, appeared in Pennsylvania. In September, 1734, Michael Finley from County Armagh, Ireland, presumably accompanied by his brother Archibald, landed in Philadelphia; and this Archibald Finley, a settler in Bucks County, according to the best authorities was the father of John Finley or Findley or Findlay, Boone's guide and companion in his famous exploration of Kentucky in 1769–1771.[14] Hither too came Mordecai Lincoln, great-grandson of Samuel Lincoln, who had emigrated from England to Hingham, Massachusetts, as early as 1637;

[11] Hanna, *Scotch-Irish*, II. 60, 63.

[12] George Boone, with his wife, emigrated to Pennsylvania in 1717; and his son George, on his arrival, produced a certificate from Bradnich meeting in Devonshire. Edward Morgan was a member of Gwynedd monthly meeting. *Cf.* Original Minutes of Abington and Gwynedd Monthly Meetings, Pa.

[13] *Cf. Bryan's Station* (Filson Club Publications, no. 12); also W. S. Ely, *The American Ararat* (Publications of the Bucks County, Pa., Historical Society); MS. History of the Bryan Family, owned by Col. W. L. Bryan, Boone, N. C.

[14] Ely, *The Finleys of Bucks* (Publications of the Bucks County, Pa., Historical Society); also Ely, "Historic Associations of Neshaminy Valley", *Daily Intelligencer* (Reading, Pa.), July 29, 1913. While Archibald, the father, spelled the surname Finley, it appears from an autograph in the possession of the Wisconsin State Historical Society, Draper MSS., 2 B 161, that the explorer spelled it Findlay.

and this Mordecai, who in 1720 settled in Chester County, Pennsylvania, was the father of Sarah Lincoln, who married William Boone, and of Abraham Lincoln, who married Anne Boone, William's first cousin.[15] Early settlers in Pennsylvania were members of the Hanks family, one of the descendants being Abraham Hanks, grandfather of the Abraham Hanks of Prince William County, Virginia, who accompanied William Calk on his journey with Richard Henderson over Boone's trail in 1775.[16]

The rising scale of prices for Pennsylvania lands, changing from ten pounds per hundred acres and two shillings quit-rents in 1719 to fifteen and a half pounds per hundred acres with a quit-rent of a half-penny per acre in 1732, soon turned the eyes of the settlers southward in the direction of new and cheaper lands, the prices for which decreased in inverse ratio to their distance from Pennsylvania. In Maryland, in 1738, lands were offered at five pounds sterling per hundred acres. Simultaneously, in the valley of Virginia, free grants of a thousand acres per family were being made; and in the Piedmont region of North Carolina, the proprietary of Lord Granville through his agents was disposing of the most desirable lands to settlers at the rate of three shillings proclamation money for six hundred and forty acres, the unit of land division, and was also making large free grants on the condition of seating a certain proportion of settlers. The rich lure of these cheap and even free lands set up a vast migration southward from Pennsylvania in the second quarter of the eighteenth century. In 1734 the Bryans migrated to Virginia, obtaining a grant near Winchester, whence they removed to the Forks of the Yadkin in North Carolina about 1750.[17] In 1750 the Boones, soon followed by the Hanks and Lincoln families, migrated southward to Virginia; and shortly afterwards, Squire Boone, sr., with his family settled at the Forks of the Yadkin in Rowan County. From 1740 there was a ceaseless tide of immigration into the valley of the Yadkin, of the Scotch-Irish and Quakers from Pennsylvania. In a letter to the Secretary of the Board of Trade from Edenton, North Carolina (Feb. 15, 1750/1),

[15] Mordecai Lincoln was the great-great-grandfather of President Lincoln. There was another connection between the Boone and Lincoln families: Mary Lincoln, daughter of Abraham Lincoln (1736–1806) and Anne Boone Lincoln, married a Joseph Boone. For data concerning the Boone and Lincoln families, I am indebted to Mr. Andrew Shaaber, the librarian of the Historical Society of Berks County, Pa. *Cf.*, also, *The Early Life of Abraham Lincoln*, by Tarbell and Davis.

[16] The original manuscript diary of William Calk is now in the possession of one of his descendants, who permitted me to examine it. William Calk's companion, Abraham Hanks, was the maternal grandfather of President Lincoln.

[17] Kercheval, *History of the Valley of Virginia.*

Governor Gabriel Johnston says, "Inhabitants flock in here daily, mostly from Pensilvania and other parts of America, who are overstocked with people and some directly from Europe, they commonly seat themselves towards the West and have got near the mountains." Writing from the same town on September 12, 1752, Bishop Spangenburg of the Moravian Church says that a considerable number of the inhabitants of North Carolina have settled here "as they wished to own land and were too poor to buy in Pennsylvania or New Jersey"; and in 1753 he observes that "even in this year more than 400 families with horse wagons and cattle have migrated to this State. . . ."[18] The immensity of this mobile, drifting mass is demonstrated by the statement of Governor William Tryon that in the summer and winter of 1765 "upwards of one thousand wagons passed thro' Salisbury with families from the northward, to settle in this province chiefly".

This southward-moving wave of migration, predominantly Scotch-Irish and English, with an admixture of a Welsh element, starting from Pennsylvania in the first quarter of the eighteenth century, swept through Maryland, and in the middle years of the century inundated the valley of Virginia and the Piedmont region of North Carolina. About Salisbury, the county seat of Rowan, now rapidly formed a settlement of people marked by strong individuality, sturdy independence, and virile self-reliance. The immigrants, following the course of the Great Trading Path, did not stop at Salisbury but radiated thence in all directions. The Morgans, Quakers and Baptists, remained in Pennsylvania, spreading over Philadelphia and Bucks counties; the Hanks and Lincoln stocks found refuge in Virginia; but the Boones and the Bryans founded their settlement at the Forks of the Yadkin. A few miles distant was the tiny hamlet of Salisbury, consisting of seven or eight log houses and the courthouse (1755).[19] The Boones and the Bryans, quickly accommodating themselves to frontier conditions much ruder and more primitive than those of their Pennsylvania home, immediately began to take an active part in the local affairs of the county.[20] The Boones quickly transferred their allegiance from the Society of Friends to the Baptist Church, worshipping at the Boone's Ford Church on the Davie side of the Yadkin; the Bryans, on the other hand, moved perhaps by the eloquence of the gentle Asbury, who often visited them, adopted Methodist principles.[21] In this region infested with

[18] For these several statements, *cf. N. C. Col. Rec.*, IV. 1073, 1312; VII. 249.

[19] *N. C. Col. Rec.*, V. 355 *et seq.*

[20] Squire Boone, shortly after his arrival in the neighborhood, was chosen justice of the peace; and Morgan Bryan was soon appearing as foreman of juries and director in road improvements in the county.

[21] Says the Rev. Francis Asbury in his *Journal*, in speaking of his frontier congregations: "In every place the congregations were large, and received the

Cherokee and Catawba Indians, Captain Anthony Hampton with his company of rangers actively patrolled the frontier; and Daniel Boone won his spurs as a soldier under the sagacious Indian fighter, commander of Fort Dobbs, Hugh Waddell.[22] Through the wilderness to the westward, across the mountains, and into the valley of the Holston, the nomadic Boone roamed at will, spying out the land, and hunting and trapping to his heart's content. In such an environment was bred the Pennsylvanian, Daniel Boone, of Quaker stock, with Baptist proclivities. Humble in origin but strongly marked in his individual democracy, Boone learned the stern frontier lessons of frugality, self-repression, and self-reliance. Here he tasted the sweets of freedom and developed the roving instinct which later marked him out as the supreme pioneer of his time. Chafing under the hampering restrictions of community life and realizing himself to be unsuited to the monotonous routine of farming, he was irresistibly impelled by his own nomadic temperament to seek the wider liberty of the wilderness. It is measurably more than surmise to say that he sought wider fields in the vague hope of enjoying there a larger degree of individual freedom under the impulse of pioneer democracy. Virginia and Pennsylvania contributed liberally to the formation of the national character in the cradle of the West. At this precise moment in history was to emerge, out of North Carolina, after a sojourn of a quarter of a century, the incarnation of the individual democracy which afterwards was to exert such a profound effect upon the development of American civilization, and to produce in time an Andrew Jackson and an Abraham Lincoln.[23]

III.

Simultaneous with the streaming of the peasant Quakers and Scotch-Irish Presbyterians into the Piedmont region of North Caro-

word with all readiness of mind. I know not that I have spent such a week since I came to America. I saw everywhere such a simplicity in the people, with such a vehement thirst after the word of God, that I frequently preached and continued in prayer till I was hardly able to stand" (I. 174). *Cf.* also Sheets, *History of Liberty Baptist Association*, and J. T. Alderman, *The Baptists at the Forks of the Yadkin* (Baptist Historical Papers).

[22] Archibald D. Murphey, "Indian Nations of North Carolina", MSS. Collections, N. C. Historical Commission. *Cf.* also Alfred Moore Waddell, *A Colonial Officer and his Times*; and Draper's manuscript Life of Boone.

[23] *Cf.* Turner, "The Significance of the Frontier in American History", *Annual Report* of the American Historical Association, 1893. In this same frontier environment which shaped the Boones and the Bryans, was born a few years later Andrew Jackson; and Mr. William Jennings Bryan is descended from a brother of the Bryan whose daughter was married to Daniel Boone.

liña,[24] having as consequence the gradual evolution of the embryonic forms of pioneer American democracy, was proceeding another movement into the counties of Orange and Granville, of families of quality and superior position, destined to exert in equally distinctive ways an ineffaceable impress upon the development of the West. In the middle years of the eighteenth century, attracted by the lure of rich and cheap lands, many families of Virginia gentry, principally from Hanover County, settled in the region ranging from Williamsborough on the east to Hillsborough on the west. Hither came the Hendersons, the Bullocks, the Williamses, the Harts, the Lewises, the Taylors, the Bentons, the Penns, the Burtons, the Hares, and the Sneeds.[25] There soon arose in this section of the colony a society marked by intellectual distinction, social graces, and the leisured dignity of the landlord and the large planter. Here was forming a new society, constituting the social link between the wealthy and predominant aristocracy in the East and the rude frontier democracy in the West. A similar type of society, that of Piedmont Virginia, produced such champions of the new democracy as Jefferson and Patrick Henry—a society composite of independent yeoman and their leaders, the large planters. It was sharply differentiated from the colonial society of the coast, being inherently democratic in instinct and aristocratic in tone. "Never scarcely in England have I seen more beautiful prospects", writes James Iredell in testimony of the beauty of the lands of Granville,[26] and its richness and productivity as agricultural and grazing land were demonstrated by the yield of great crops of Indian corn and other grain, and the vast droves of cattle and hogs. So conspicuous for means, intellect, culture, and refinement were the people of this social group—a people with "abundance of wealth and leisure for enjoyment", says the quaint old diarist, Hugh McAden[27]—that Governor Josiah Martin, passing through Granville and Bute counties on his way from Hillsborough in 1772, significantly remarks: "They have great pre-eminence, as well with respect to soil and cultivation, as

[24] S. B. Weeks, *Southern Quakers and Slavery*; also *William and Mary College Quarterly*, XII. 129–134; Henderson, *Life and Times of Richard Henderson*; *Biographical Hist. of N. C.*

[25] W. H. Battle, "Memoir of Chief Justice Leonard Henderson", *N. C. Univ. Mag.*, November, 1859; T. B. Kingsbury, "Chief Justice Leonard Henderson", *Wake Forest Student*, November, 1898; R. W. Winston, "Leonard Henderson", Frank Nash, "Hillsborough, Colonial and Revolutionary", Nash, "History of Orange County", *N. C. Booklet*. The author has also had the privilege of examining the valuable collection of Hart-Benton MSS., kindly placed at his disposal by Miss Lucretia Hart Clay, of Lexington, Ky.

[26] McRee, *Life and Correspondence of James Iredell*, I. 434.

[27] Foote, *Sketches of N. C.*

to the manners and condition of the inhabitants, in which last respect the difference is so great that one would be led to think them people of another region."[28] From this society came such eminent democratic figures as the father-in-law and preceptor of Henry Clay, Thomas Hart; his grandson, the "Old Bullion" and "Great Pacificator" of a later era, Thomas Hart Benton; Richard Henderson, president of the colony of Transylvania, known to his contemporaries as the "Patrick Henry of North Carolina"; John Penn, signer of the Declaration of Independence; William Kennon, eloquent advocate of the Mecklenburg Resolves of May 31, 1775; and others almost equally distinguished. Like the society of the Virginia Piedmont, it was, to employ the words of Turner, "a society naturally expansive, seeing its opportunity to deal in unoccupied lands along the frontier which continually moved toward the West, and in this era of the eighteenth century dominated by the democratic ideals of pioneers rather than by the aristocratic tendencies of slave-holding planters".[29] From the cross-fertilization of this society of gentry, of innate qualities of leadership, democratic instincts, economic cast, and expansive tendencies, with the primitive, pioneer society of the frontier, frugal in taste, responsive to leadership, ready and thorough in execution, there was evolved the militant expansive movement in American life. Out of the ancient breeding-ground of North Carolina, from the co-operative union of transplanted Pennsylvania and Virginia stocks, came at the same moment the spirit of governmental control with popular liberty, and the spirit of individual colonization, restive under control. In the initial co-ordination of these two instincts, with the subsequent triumph of the latter over the former, is told the story of the beginning of American expansion.[30]

Soon after his arrival in Rowan, Squire Boone, sr., residing at the Forks of the Yadkin some twelve miles from Salisbury, was chosen as one of the worshipful justices of the county court. From the earliest sessions of the court, three years before the erection of a court-house, he acted in this capacity, deciding the many simple questions arising under frontier conditions: registering the branding marks for cattle; selecting constables and road-overseers, and their routes; determining the scale of prices of foods and liquors for the licensed hostelries; and the like. By the end of 1756 he was presiding in the new court-house—a frame-work structure, thirty feet

[28] *N. C. Col. Rec.*, IX. 349. Martin comments: "These advantages arise I conceive from the vicinity of Virginia, from whence I understand many, invited by the superior excellence of the soil have imigrated to settle in these counties."

[29] Turner, "The Old West", Wis. Hist. Soc. *Proc.*, 1903.

[30] See Henderson, "The Pioneer Contributions of North Carolina to Kentucky", *Charlotte Observer*, November 10, 1913.

long and twenty feet wide, provided with an oval bar and "cases" for the attorneys. One of the attorneys who occupied one of these "cases" and argued suits before Squire Boone was a young man of Granville County, whose geniality had won him many friends and whose ability had won him a large legal practice.[31] "Even in the superior courts where oratory and eloquence are as brilliant and powerful as in Westminster-hall", says an English acquaintance of Henderson's, "he soon became distinguished and eminent, and his superior genius shone forth with great splendour, and universal applause." Wedded to the daughter of an Irish lord,[32] and moving in the refined circle which included a Richard Bennehan, an Alexander Martin, a John Penn, a William Hooper, and their compeers, he was nevertheless conspicuously democratic by conviction and in practice. His law-partner, who married the widow of Lord Keeling, was John Williams—a stout exponent of the principles of democracy. Among his intimate friends was that "aristocrat in temperament, but democrat in politics", Thomas Hart, whom an acquaintance, Dr. J. F. D. Smyth, described as "an accomplished and complete gentleman". Henderson was well acquainted with Squire Boone, frequently appearing on legal business before him; and likewise formed the acquaintance of his son, Daniel, the nomadic spirit, hunter, and trapper, who occasionally told him bizarre and startling tales of his wanderings across the dark green mountains to the fair valleys and boundless hunting grounds beyond. These stories of Western explorations Henderson heard from the lips of Daniel Boone himself, who was eager to remove to the West at the first convenient opportunity.[33]

Daniel Boone was an explorer of remarkable individual initiative. Prior to 1769 he had already travelled as far as Florida on the south and as far as Kentucky on the west. During the period from 1763 to 1769, doubtless through his long extended absences and his enforced neglect of affairs at home, he became deeply involved financially. His nomadic instincts, with the consequent neglect of the work on his farm, seem to have prejudiced even his father against him. The heavy indebtedness which he incurred—indeed the entire career of the simple-hearted pioneer demonstrates his constitutional carelessness in business and financial transactions—involved him in suits instituted against him by some of the most prominent citizens of Salisbury—John Lewis Beard, the philanthro-

[31] The earliest court records of Granville County show that he and his first cousin, John Williams, enjoyed the most extensive practice in the court.

[32] Kingsbury, "Chief Justice Leonard Henderson", *loc. cit.*

[33] Draper's MS. Life of Boone.

pist and devout churchman; Dr. Anthony Newnan, the active Whig; Hugh Montgomery, the wealthy landlord of Wilkes; John Mitchell; and others.[34] In this hour of his poverty and distress, Boone turned to his friends, the law-partners, Henderson and Williams. "A person so just and upright" as Boone could have become involved in such financial difficulties only through a certain naïve indifference to the forms of law and heedless neglect of customary business precaution. In reference to this gloomy period in Boone's career, Thomas Hart wrote his brother Nathaniel in 1780: "I have known Boone in times of old, when poverty and distress had him fast by the hand; and in these wretched circumstances, I have ever found him of a noble and generous soul, despising everything mean."[35]

In the earlier years of Boone's residence in Rowan, at some time prior to 1763, Richard Henderson first formed the acquaintance of Boone. The fact of cardinal importance is that he knew Boone in a two-fold capacity—not only as hunter, trapper, and explorer, but also as surveyor and road-maker. Not without distinct historic significance was it that in the year 1763, and so, at the same time with England's futile proclaimed estoppel of purchase of lands from the Indians by individuals or corporations without crown grants,[36] Richard Henderson one day rose from his "case" in the tiny courthouse of Rowan, and facing the "oval bar" which supported the elevated bench from which Squire Boone, as one of the "worshipful justices", had for a decade dispensed rude justice, moved the following:

> It is ordered that a Waggon Road, the best and nearest, be built from the Shallow Ford upon the Yadkin River to the Town of Salisbury, and the following persons are appointed to lay off and mark the same, to wit, Daniel Boone, Morgan Bryan, Samuel Bryan, and James Bryan . . . and accordingly they appear upon Notice and be qualified before the nearest Magistrate for their Faithful discharge of their office etc.

[34] Court records.

[35] Morehead's *Address*, at Boonesborough (1840), p. 105, note.

[36] The royal proclamation of October 7, 1763, avowed it to be his Majesty's "fixed determination to permit no grants of lands nor any settlements to be made within certain fixed Bounds . . . leaving all that territory within it free for the hunting grounds of those Indian subjects of your majesty". Text in *Michigan Pioneer and Historical Collections*, XXXVI. 14–19 (1908). In his elaborate papers on the subject of British Western policy, Professor C. W. Alvord, however, successfully maintains that the royal proclamation of 1763 did not set permanent western limits to the colonies, and that it was the intention of the Board of Trade to promote westward expansion by the peaceful purchase from time to time, under royal authority, of land situated in the Indian reservation. *Cf.* "The Genesis of the Proclamation of 1763", *Michigan Pioneer and Historical Collections*, vol. XXXVI.; "The British Ministry and the Treaty of Fort Stanwix", Wisconsin Historical Society *Proceedings*, 1908.

When the time was ripe for the defiance of the edict of crown governors against purchases from the Indians without royal grants, upon the basis of the royal proclamation of 1763, it was but natural that Henderson should engage as the man best fitted to spy out the wilderness of Kentucky and later to cut out a passage thereto through the dense and tangled laurel thickets—a passage far-famed in history as the Wilderness Road—his friend "Dan Boone", as he familiarly called him, whom he had known for many years as a most competent scout and expert road-cutter in the frontier county of Rowan.

V.

The designs which Henderson and his associates cherished for the acquisition of Western lands found early expression in some form of organization. After the proclamation of 1763, which assured the lands at least temporarily to the Indians, these men realized that these lands must eventually be thrown open to colonization.[37] They accordingly organized themselves into some sort of company, for the purpose of engaging an expert scout and surveyor to spy out the Western lands, and later to examine into the feasibility of making a purchase ultimately from the Indians. Their original intention, indubitably, was to colonize the territory thus to be acquired. But when the clouds of war finally gathered and a clash with Great Britain loomed threatening and imminent on the horizon, their original plan of extensive colonization inevitably assumed momentous political consequences; and in the event they endeavored to found a fourteenth American colony in the heart of the Western wilderness.

This company, so far as known, has left no documentary record of its activities in the earlier stages of its existence. All the evidence points to the fact that it consisted of three partners only: Richard Henderson, Thomas Hart, and John Williams. The organization first bore the name of "Richard Henderson and Company". Some years later, after the plans for colonization had passed the stage of preliminary investigation, new partners were successively added. The name of the organization, "Richard Henderson and

[37] The chief object of the proclamation of 1763 was to allay the alarm of the Indians; and in pursuance of this idea the colonists were positively prohibited from making settlements on the Indian lands. Nevertheless the roving bands of determined settlers along the Indian border rendered the situation critical. In the very preamble of the proclamation, the Lords of Trade describe the sovereign as "being desirous that all Our loving subjects, as well of Our Kingdom as of Our Colonies in America, may avail themselves with all convenient Speed, of the great Benefits and Advantages which must accrue therefrom etc." The veiled intent of the Board of Trade, it would appear, was to control, not to prevent, expansion westward.

Company", was altered, first to the "Louisa Company", and then to the "Transylvania Company".[38]

The first exploration which Daniel Boone ever made on behalf of Richard Henderson and Company was in the year following the royal proclamation of 1763. The partners evidently anticipated Washington in the realization that the proclamation was only a temporary expedient to quiet the minds of the Indians. Boone was vastly impressed by the Western territory as a field for settlement; and was eager on his own account to move his family to this new region. It is clear that he anticipated removal to the West with his family, as the immediate result of his first exploration in the interest of Henderson and Company.[39] Boone's enthusiastic descriptions of the Western wilderness retailed to Henderson and his associates, Hart and Williams, doubtless aroused in their minds the first suggestion of the larger opportunities for settlement and investment afforded by the rich but tenantless West. Accordingly they engaged Boone, who upon all his pioneering and hunting expeditions continued to penetrate further and further westward, to do double duty upon his next expedition. Boone was instructed, while hunting and trapping on his own account, to make a wider cast than he had ever made before, to examine the lands with respect to their location and fertility, and to report his findings upon his return.

The expedition must have been transacted with considerable circumspection. In 1767 George Washington, writing to his agent, Crawford, with reference to threatened future competition for the best Western lands, shrewdly counsels: "All this may be avoided by a silent management, and the operation carried on by you under the guize of hunting game."[40] With a business sagacity like that of Washington, who was later to learn of Henderson's desire to found an independent colony in the West, Henderson fully realized that the exploration must be conducted with circumspection, if the lands were to be secured.[41] Boone proved himself a thor-

[38] Kentucky MSS., I.; Draper MSS. *Cf.* Alden, *New Governments west of the Alleghanies before 1780* (Madison, Wis.).

[39] The county records show that in the early part of this same year, *viz.* on February 21, 1764, Daniel Boone and his wife "Rebeckah" sold all their property in North Carolina—consisting of a home and 640 acres of land.

[40] Washington to Crawford, September 21, 1767, Sparks, *Life and Writings of Washington*, II. 346–350. In the same letter, Washington admonishes Crawford to "keep the whole matter a secret, or trust it only to those in whom you may confide, and who can assist you in bringing it to bear by their discoveries of land".

[41] The meagreness of our information on the subject of this initial exploration may thus be naturally explained. An acquaintance of Henderson mentions that the latter preserved the strictest secrecy about his earlier land ventures. Repeatedly taxed afterwards with having acted as the agent of the land company, Boone consistently and most honorably refused to violate Henderson's confidence.

oughly satisfactory agent for the examination of the country, his trustworthiness being in no small measure due to his ingrained taciturnity and his faculty of keeping his own counsel. It is obvious, however, that Henderson gave to Boone, as Washington gave to Crawford, discretion to trust the secret of his errand to those in whom he could confide and who might assist him in making further discoveries of land. In one instance, at least, the circumspect Boone deemed it prudent to communicate the purpose of his mission to some hunters in order to secure the results of their information in regard to the best lands they had encountered in the course of their hunting expedition. In the autumn of 1764, during the journey of the Blevins party of hunters, to their hunting ground on the Rock Castle River, near the Crab Orchard in Kentucky, Daniel Boone came among the hunters, at one of their Tennessee station camps, in order, as expressed in the quaint phraseology of the day, "to be informed of the geography and locography of these woods, saying that he was employed to explore them by Henderson and Company".[42] In this tour of exploration, Boone hunted and scouted through the valleys of the Tennessee and the Holston, but did not penetrate to the fabled region of Kentucky. His companion on this expedition was his relative, Samuel Callaway, and together they accomplished a two-fold object: hunting and trapping on their own account, and secretly prospecting and exploring on behalf of the land company.[43]

VI.

Just why Henderson and his associates did not act immediately upon the report brought back by Boone and Callaway—a report doubtless highly favorable, as was the case with all the "news of a far country" brought home by the pioneers—there is no extant ex-

[42] Haywood, *Tennessee*, p. 35. The accuracy of Haywood's testimony in this instance must be recognized as indisputable. Judge John Haywood was intimately associated, both personally and legally, with Richard Henderson's two sons, Archibald and Leonard; and his successor to the post of reading clerk to the North Carolina House of Commons, in 1789, was his friend, Major Pleasant Henderson, Richard's brother and pioneer with Boone at Boonesborough, and with Robertson at the French Lick. On his removal to Tennessee, Judge Haywood formed the personal acquaintance of many of the pioneers, from whom he received innumerable accounts of their personal experiences. Notable figures among the pioneers in Tennessee, such as James Robertson, John Sevier, and Timothée de Monbrun, were personally known to the Tennessee historians, Haywood and Putnam,

[43] Ramsey (*Annals of Tennessee*) unearthed the fact that Boone, while acting as the secret agent of the land company, was accompanied by Callaway—a fact which Ramsey, with his intimate knowledge of the pioneers and their history, probably derived directly from Callaway or his immediate descendants.

planatory evidence. Henderson and Williams, as law-partners, were engaged in an extensive and lucrative law practice; and in the prosecution of their profession spent a large proportion of their time in travelling from one end of the extensive colony of North Carolina to the other.[44] The heavy obligations of this extensive and rapidly enlarging law business in all probability sufficed to delay the immediate prosecution of the Western enterprise.

It was not, indeed, until several years later that Henderson and Company once more actively interested themselves in the problem of Western investment and colonization. In the *Virginia Gazette* of December 1, 1768, a newspaper in which he advertised, Henderson must have read with astonishment not unmixed with dismay, that "the Six Nations and all their tributaries have granted a vast extent of country to his majesty, and the Proprietaries of Pennsylvania, and settled an advantageous boundary line between their hunting country and this, and the other colonies to the Southward as far as the Cherokee river, for which they received the most valuable present in goods and dollars that was ever given at any conference since the settlement of America." It was now generally bruited about the colony of North Carolina that the Cherokees were deeply resentful because the Northern Indians at the treaty of Fort Stanwix had been handsomely remunerated for territory which they, the Cherokees, claimed from time immemorial.[45] Henderson, who had consulted often with Boone and reflected deeply over the subject, foresaw that the Western lands, though ostensibly thrown open for settlement under the aegis of Virginia, could only be legally obtained by extinguishing the Cherokee title. His prescience was directly confirmed by royal action, when Stuart, superintendent for Indian affairs in the Southern Department, at the treaty of Hard Labor, October 14, 1768, acknowledged the Cherokee title by establishing the western boundary as a line running from the top of Tryon Mountain (now in Polk County, North Carolina, on the South Carolina line) direct to Colonel Chiswell's mine (now Austinville, Virginia), and thence in a straight line to the mouth of the Great Kanawha River.[46]

[44] *Cf.* McRee, *Life and Correspondence of James Iredell*, I. 96–97; Henderson, *Life and Times of Richard Henderson*, ch. II.

[45] *Cf.* Ranck, *Boonesborough* (Filson Club Publications, no. 16); also Henderson, "Forerunners of the Republic: Richard Henderson and American Expansion", *Neale's Monthly*, January, 1913.

[46] *N. C. Col. Rec.*, VII. 851–855. "Should they [the Cherokees] refuse to give it up", writes Johnson to Gage (December 16, 1768), with reference to the action at the treaty of Fort Stanwix, "it is in his majesty's power to prevent the colonies from availing themselves of the late cession in that quarter, till it can be done with safety and the common consent of all who have just pretensions to it". *Cf.* Stone, *Life of Sir William Johnson*, II. 307; *Journals of the House of Burgesses of Virginia*, 1770–1772, preface, p. xix.

It was at this crucial moment that the horse peddler, John Findlay, Boone's old friend of the Braddock campaign, wandered into the valley of the Yadkin. Findlay had actually been successful in reaching Kentucky in 1752; and now delighted Boone with his stories of the desirability of the country and the plentifulness of the game. The conjunction was a fortunate one in many respects. Boone was heavily in debt to his attorneys, the firm of Williams and Henderson, for legal services, and to other prominent citizens of Rowan County. Indeed he had been summoned to appear in Salisbury at the March term of court. John Findlay, John Stuart, and Daniel Boone all came to Salisbury to attend court, Judge Henderson arriving on March 5.[47] The attested presence at Salisbury of Boone, Findlay, and Stuart, three of the six explorers of Kentucky in 1769, simultaneous with Henderson, only a short time before the departure of Boone's party on their tour of exploration, makes it highly probable that the final conference to devise ways and means for the expedition was held at this time and place. Certain it is that on May 1, 1769, Daniel Boone as the confidential agent of Richard Henderson and Company, accompanied by five companions, left his "peaceable habitation" on the Yadkin for a two years' exploration of Kentucky.[48]

Boone and Findlay visited Kentucky in 1769, not only to hunt and trap, but "for the purpose of examining the country".[49] Boone himself relates that he and Stuart, after getting settled in their camp, "proceeded to take a more thorough survey of the country";[50] and the entire course of Boone's actions during this period demonstrates that some powerful influence held him in Kentucky until his work of exploration was completed. Had Boone desired merely to discover a location for his own and neighboring families living at the Forks of the Yadkin, he might easily have discovered such a location in Madison and Garrard counties, which he first visited, or in the

[47] Court records. See also "Diary of Waightstill Avery", *N. C. Univ. Magazine*, 1856. Judge Henderson left Salisbury for Hillsborough on March 16.

[48] Aside from numerous authorities, from Peck, who studied Boone's career during Boone's own lifetime, down to the author of *The Winning of the West*, there is the testimony of those historical students who were fortified by the contemporary documents—Lossing, who examined the Transylvania papers lent him by President D. L. Swain of the University of North Carolina in 1856 (Swain's original letter to Lossing is now in the writer's possession); Hall, who examined the vast mass of evidence in the Hogg Papers, chiefly letters of the partners of the Transylvania Company; and Putnam, authentically informed through his intimate personal acquaintance with the early pioneers as well as through his unrivalled collection of pioneer documents. Thus, independently, from North Carolina, Kentucky, and Tennessee, the fact is related in identical form, from documentary evidence, as well as from personal record.

[49] Filson.

[50] "Memorial to the Legislature of Kentucky."

neighborhood of Station Camp Creek, in Estill County. Had he desired merely to hunt and fish and trap, he might well have found satiety in the proximity of his first camps. But there was a motive deeper than the desire to discover a location for a few families, or to range far and wide in search of game which was bounteous in plenty in his immediate vicinity. This motive was, assuredly, to employ Boone's own words, "to recruit his shattered circumstances"; and his financial obligations were to Williams and Henderson for legal services, and to other prominent citizens of Rowan County. The prosecution of the task of exhaustively exploring the Kentucky area was indubitably undertaken by Boone in the effort to meet these financial obligations.

Disheartened by his disasters, his two captures by the Indians and the loss of all his peltries, Boone would otherwise have welcomed the opportunity to return to North Carolina with his brother Squire, who came out with supplies.[51] It is extremely likely, in the light of subsequent events, that Squire Boone bore a message from Henderson to Daniel Boone, urging upon him, now that he was in the country, to remain in it long enough to secure a more detailed knowledge of its geographical and topographical features. With Squire Boone, John Stuart, and Alexander Neely as companions, Daniel Boone at once began that elaborate series of explorations ranging from the Kentucky River on the north to the Green and Cumberland rivers on the south. By the first of May, 1770, the exploration of Kentucky had only just begun; so that Boone, fixed in the resolve to accomplish the undertaking upon which he had been despatched, preferred to remain alone in Kentucky while Squire returned home. From this time forward, Daniel Boone ranges far and wide through north-central Kentucky, visiting the Big Lick and the Blue Lick, exploring the valleys of the Kentucky and the Licking, and travelling as far down the Ohio as the Falls, the present Louisville. In July and again in September, following a second return to the settlement for supplies, Squire rejoined Daniel in Kentucky; and from December, 1770, until March, 1771, they scouted through the southern and western portions of Kentucky, exploring the valleys of the Green and Cumberland rivers, and hunting in company with the Long Hunters, among whom were Kasper Mansker, who discovered the lick that bears his name, and Henry Skaggs, who,

[51] *Cf.* Boone's *Autobiography* (Filson). It is problematical but not unlikely that Squire Boone was sent out with these supplies for Daniel Boone and party by the land company. It is noteworthy that Squire Boone was accompanied on his journey by one of the Neely family, Alexander, for whom Henderson had hitherto acted as legal counsel.

because of his knowledge of the Cumberland area, as reported by Boone to Henderson, was subsequently engaged to act as the agent of the land company, fixing his station at Mansker's Lick.[52]

On his return to North Carolina in 1771, Boone's glowing description of Kentucky "soon excited in others the spirit of an enterprise which in point of magnitude and peril, as well as constancy and heroism displayed in its execution, has never been paralleled in the history of America".[53] In 1772, the Watauga settlers secured from the Cherokee Indians, for a valuable consideration, a ten years' lease of the lands upon which they were settled. Boone, who had established friendly relations with James Robertson, communicated to Henderson the details of the leases and purchases which Robertson, Brown, and Sevier had made of the rich valley lands. After consulting with the Indians, Robertson informed Boone, acting as Henderson's confidential agent, that he believed, if the inducement were large enough, the Indians would sell. Following his own disastrous failure to effect individual colonization without attempting to secure by purchase the Indian title, in 1773, Boone in 1774 advised Henderson and his associates that the Cherokees were disposed to sell the Kentucky area.[54] Having previously assured himself of the legal validity of the purchase and after personally visiting the Cherokee chiefs in their principal village to secure their consent to the sale, Henderson proceeded to reorganize the land company, first into the Louisa and then into the Transylvania Company. With the aid of his associates he carried through the treaty of Sycamore Shoals, purchased for £10,000 sterling the Indian title to the greater portion of the Kentucky area, and commissioned Boone to cut out a passage to the heart of Kentucky. Boonesborough became the focus of the great struggles for predominance on the Western frontier.[55] There

[52] An exhaustive study of Boone's itinerary has been made by the present writer, in order to fix the exact route which he followed. In addition to the wealth of local materials, the Draper MSS., including Draper's Life of Boone, are rich in information on the subject. Through the personal investigations of Mr. John P. Arthur, of Asheville, N. C., who went over Boone's route in North Carolina, as well as the researches of the present writer, this portion of the route has recently been marked by the Daughters of the American Revolution under the direction of Mrs. J. Lindsay Patterson, of Winston-Salem, N. C. *Cf. Home and Country*, April, 1914; *Sky-Land*, September, 1914.

[53] Morehead's *Address* at Boonesborough (1840).

[54] In a little newspaper, *The Harbinger*, published at Chapel Hill, N. C., in 1834, the venerable Pleasant Henderson, brother of Richard and fellow-pioneer with Boone at Boonesborough, writing from Tennessee, relates that in 1774 Richard Henderson was "induced to attempt a purchase of that country (the Kentucky area) from the Cherokee Indians through the suggestions and advice of the late Col. Daniel Boone".

[55] *Cf.* the writer's *Life and Times of Richard Henderson*; "The Beginnings of American Expansion"; and "Forerunners of the Republic: Richard Hender-

was the struggle of the white man against the red man, of the colonial against the Briton. There was the struggle of the Transylvania Company, first against royal authority, and then against the authority of Virginia. But deeper than all was the struggle between the spirit of individual colonization as embodied in the pioneers, and the spirit of commercial enterprise as embodied in the Transylvania Company. The conflict between the individualistic democracy of the pioneer and the commercial proprietorship of the Transylvania Company was settled only when George Rogers Clark, with iron hand, forced upon Virginia his own selection as virtual military dictator of the West. The drastic settlement of that conflict also made possible the most spectacular and meteoric campaign in Western history—closing only when Clark and his unterrified frontiersmen grounded their arms in Kaskaskia and Vincennes.[56]

In his appeal to the Kentucky legislature, the octogenarian Boone says that he "may claim, without arrogance, to have been the author of the principal means which contributed to the settlement of a country on the Mississippi and its waters, which now (1812) produces the happiness of a million of his fellow-creatures; and of the exploring and acquisition of a country that will make happy many millions in time to come". The present research compels us to discount the high-flown language of the ancient petitioner for land. Boone was the pathfinder and way-breaker—wonderful independent explorer and equally skilled executant of the designs of others.[57] But to Henderson, Hart, Williams, and their associates, animated by the spirit of constructive civilization, rather than to Boone, with his unsocial and nomadic instincts, belongs the larger measure of credit for the inauguration of the militant expansionist movement of West-

son and American Expansion", *loc. cit.* In a supplementary paper, the present writer purposes to detail, *in extenso*, the history of this expansionist movement from 1772 onward. All the accounts hitherto given of this momentous episode in our national history are singularly fragmentary and inaccurate. The recent discovery by the present writer of many documents not hitherto accessible to historical students clarifies the entire situation. Only now for the first time is it possible to throw into true perspective Boone's abortive effort to invade Kentucky in 1773, his relation to the Transylvania Company in the capacity of confidential agent, Henderson's prudent procedure in securing the highest legal sanction for the purchase, the details of the "Great Treaty" of Sycamore Shoals, the invasion of Kentucky in 1775, and the subsequent history, both governmental and corporate, of the Transylvania Company.

[56] Henderson, "Forerunners of the Republic: George Rogers Clark and the Western Crisis", *Neale's Monthly*, June, 1913; James, *George Rogers Clark Papers, 1771–1781* (Ill. Hist. Soc. Publications, vol. VIII.); Turner, "Western State-Making in the Revolutionary Era", AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, I. 70–87, 251–269.

[57] *Cf.* Henderson, "Forerunners of the Republic: Daniel Boone", *Neale's Monthly*, February, 1913.

ern colonization. The creative causes of the Westward movement were rooted, not in romance, but in economic enterprise, not in Providence, but in political vision. It was the Transylvania Company which at its own expense successfully colonized the Kentucky area with between two and three hundred men; and with true revolutionary ardor defying the royal authority as expressed through the crown governors of the colonies of North Carolina and Virginia, exhausted all means, through appeals to the Continental Congress, to Patrick Henry, Jefferson, and the Adamses, and finally to the legislature of Virginia, in their ultimately fruitless efforts to create a fourteenth American colony. And yet, despite this failure, Henderson and his associates furnished to the world "one of the most heroic displays of that typical American spirit of comprehensive aggrandizement of which so much is heard to-day".[58] It is a coincidence of historic significance that just one day after the dropping musketry at Lexington and Concord was heard round the world, Henderson and his little band reached the site of the future Boonesborough. Here the colonists reared a bulwark of enduring strength to resist the fierce incursions of bands of hostile savages during the period of the American Revolution. Unquestionably the strenuous borderers, with their roving instincts, would in any event ultimately have established impregnable strongholds in the Kentucky area. But had it not been for the Transylvania Company and Daniel Boone, no secure stronghold, to protect the whites against the savages, might have been established and fortified in 1775. In that event, the American colonies, convulsed in a titanic struggle, might well have seen Kentucky overrun by savage hordes, led by English officers, throughout the Revolution. In consequence, the American colonies at the close of the Revolution would probably have been compelled to leave in British hands the vast and fertile regions beyond the Alleghanies.

ARCHIBALD HENDERSON.

[58] Hulbert, *Pilots of the Republic*.

DOCUMENTS

Letters relating to the Negotiations at Ghent, 1812–1814

THE history of the negotiations at Ghent is already so fully known that we are not to expect the discovery of new documents which will alter it in its essential features. Certainly it is not imagined that the papers which follow do this; yet it may be thought that, when brought together from a variety of repositories, they cast an interesting light on some aspects of the negotiation, and especially, since nearly all are private letters, upon the state of mind of the commissioners at different periods in their task.

For the first two we are indebted to Professor Frank A. Golder of the State College of Washington, who has been exploring the materials for American history in the archives of St. Petersburg, on behalf of the Department of Historical Research in the Carnegie Institution of Washington. They show the Russian chancellor, Count Romanzoff, sending offers of mediation to Great Britain, through Russia's representative in London, three days before his interview with Adams on September 21 (N. S.), 1812, in which he proposed it to the United States in terms much the same as those of the letter here printed. Romanzoff told Adams that he had already made the offer to Cathcart, British ambassador, who was to transmit it to his government,[1] but the present letter is not mentioned.

Of the other letters, seven are derived from the Crawford Transcripts in the Library of Congress, a small but interesting series of photostat facsimiles of originals in the possession of Miss Fannie Crawford, of Columbus, Mississippi. Crawford, American minister in Paris 1813–1815, was the nearest, of all American public men of the first rank, to the commissioners at Ghent. It was natural that they should write freely to him, and, as Mr. Henry Adams has shown in his *Life of Gallatin*,[2] Crawford was able to perform some substantial services to them. One of his letters is here printed, derived from the papers of Jonathan Russell in the library of Brown University. The letter of Russell to Crawford printed below is of curious interest as anticipating in spirit, and to some extent in sub-

[1] Adams, *Memoirs*, II. 401–404.

[2] Pp. 510–513; see also *Writings of Gallatin*, I. 619, 622. Copies of these same letters of Crawford and Lafayette are among the Jonathan Russell Papers in the library of Brown University.

stance, his virulent attack on Adams, in a letter of the next year to Clay.[3]

Two letters, to which the editor's attention was called by Professor Ulrich B. Phillips of the University of Michigan, are from the Adams manuscripts in the custody of the Massachusetts Historical Society. Two are from the papers of James A. Bayard, possessed by his great-grandson, Richard H. Bayard, Esq., of Baltimore; and one, also of Bayard, is from the cabinet of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania. A much fuller exhibit of Bayard's relation to the whole mission will be presented by the ample publication of his papers, as the next volume of the Historical Manuscripts Commission, in the forthcoming *Annual Report* of the American Historical Association for 1913.

Cordial thanks are offered to all those possessors or custodians of manuscripts who have contributed to the present collection—Mr. Sergius Goriainov, chief of the archives of the Imperial Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Dr. Gaillard Hunt, chief of the Division of Manuscripts in the Library of Congress, Professor Harry L. Koopman, librarian of Brown University, Mr. Worthington C. Ford of the Massachusetts Historical Society, Mr. Richard H. Bayard, and Dr. John W. Jordan, librarian of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania.

I. Count Romanzoff to Baron P. de Nicolay.[4]

Monsieur le Baron,

La Paix de la Russie avec l'Angleterre paroissait présenter cet immense benefice au Commerce de presque tous les peuples navigateurs, qu'elle affranchissait leur rélations de cette gêne, de cette tourmente continuelle à la quelle il étoit sans cesse livrée depuis quelques années. L'Empereur consideroit avec plaisir un resultât aussi conforme à toutes Ses pensées et qui se présentoit comme n'étant pas douteux. Il le devient cependant par la guerre qui s'allume entre l'Angleterre et l'Amérique.

Sa Majesté Impériale voit à regret que cette nouvelle episode va placer de si grandes entrâves à la prospérité Commerciale des Nations. L'amour de l'humanité et ce qu'elle doit à Ses peuples, dont le Commerce a déja assés souffert, Lui commande de faire tout ce qui dépendra d'Elle, pour écarter les maux que prépare cette guerre aux Peuples même qui n'y prendront pas de part. Sa Majesté, qui Se plait à rendre justice à la

[3] The letter alluded to, dated Stockholm, October 15, 1815, was printed as a broadside for political use by the Jackson men in 1827, and is reprinted in the *Proceedings* of the Massachusetts Historical Society, XLIV. 308–317.

[4] This document is classified in the Archives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in St. Petersburg as "Londres, 1812, no. 23, Exp." Baron Nicolay was Russian chargé d'affaires at London in the absence of Count Lieven, the ambassador. The language of the letter resembles very closely that which Adams reports Romanzoff as using in an interview with him three days later, September 21. Adams, *Memoirs*, II. 401–403; *American State Papers, Foreign Relations*, III. 625.

sagesse du Cabinet de St. James, est convaincu qu'il a fait tout ce qu'il pouvait, pour empêcher que cette scission n'éclatât; mais en traitant directement il etoit à cette négociation ce qu'elle pouvoit avoir d'impartial. Dans une discution directe, tout devoit offrir une sorte d'aliment aux préventions et à l'aigreur des partis. Sa Majesté, afin d'obvier à cet inconvenient et charmée de pouvoir donner une preuve de Son amitié à S. M'té le Roy de la Grande Bretagne et également aux Etats Unis d'Amérique, leur offre Sa médiation: Elle vous charge, Monsieur, de la proposer et si elle est acceptée par la Cour de Londres, l'Empereur fera faire la même offre aux Etâts Unis et la négociation, pour un si utile rapprochement, pourroit s'ouvrir à Petersbourg, sous les auspices et la sollicitude directe de Sa Majesté.

L'Empereur le confesse, Il éprouveroit une grande satisfaction, si au gré de Ses voeux, Il parvenoit à éteindre cette guerre nouvelle, dès son Origine.

Je Vous recommande, Monsieur le Baron, de me faire part de la manière dont Mylord Castlereagh aura accueilli la proposition que vous êtes chargé de faire.

Agrées je vous prie l'assurance renouvellée de la Considération très distinguée avec laquelle j'ai l'honneur d'être,

Monsieur le Baron
Votre très humble et très
Obéissant Serviteur
Le Comte de Romanzoff.

St. Petersbourg
ce 6/18 Septembre
1812.

II. Nicolay to Romanzoff.[5]

Monseigneur,

Je n'ai pas négligé de profiter de la prémiére occasion que m'offrait mon entrevûe avec Lord Liverpool pour lui faire part, en attendant l'arrivée de Mylord Castleragh,[6] de la dépêche de Votre Excellence qui contient la proposition de la Médiation de Sa Majesté l'Empereur entre la Grande Bretagne et les Etats Unis. Le Prémier Ministre en me témoignant d'avance la sensibilité avec la quelle une pareille marque d'amitié de la part de Sa Majesté Impériale devait être recüe ici, m'a représenté qu'après toutes les mesures conciliatoires qui avaient été adoptées envers les Etats Américains, Mr. l'amiral Warren, commandant en chef en Amérique, avait en dernier ressort été mûni encore de Pleinpouvoirs de retablir la paix entre les deux Pays;[7] que l'on pouvait en attendre quelque resultat dans un Mois d'ici, et que jusques là il serait peutêtre plus sage de ne rien entreprendre de nouveau. Le début assez désastreux qu'ont éprouvé les opérations militaires des Américains, les nouvelles élections qui commencent le mois prochain, enfin l'esprit public en Amérique qui se prononce asses fortement contre la guerre, toutes ces circonstances paraissent encore entretenir ici de l'espoir pour le retour

[5] This letter bears no date, except the words, in Russian, at the top of the first page, "Received 4 November 1812". It may be referred to as "Londres, 1812, no. 3, Rec."

[6] Liverpool was prime minister at the time, Castlereagh foreign secretary.

[7] See Warren to Monroe, September 30, in *Am. St. P., For. Rel.*, III. 595.

prochain des relations amicales avec les Etats Unis. Si Mr. Madison venait a être réélû l'on s'attend à une séparation entre les Provinces du Nord et celles du Sud.

J'ai pensé, Monseigneur, joindre ici pour cette fois le Courier d'Angleterre parcequ'il contient un Article des Etats Unis qui est regardé ici comme très intéressant.

Je suis avec le plus profond respect,
Monseigneur,
de Votre Excellence,
le très-humble et très
obéissant Serviteur
LE B'ON P. DE NICOLAY.

III. CLAY TO W. H. CRAWFORD.[8]

GHENT 2d July 1814

My Dr Sir,

I reached this place on tuesday last after a journey[9] for the most part excessively unpleasant, and found here three of my colleagues, from one of whom I had the pleasure to receive your agreeable favor of the 10th ulto. I also had for the first time an opportunity of reading your interesting communications to the joint mission, and I beg you to accept my individual thanks, as you deserve those of your Country, for the exertions you have made in promoting the [*blot*] of our labours. On the subject of our instructions, in relation to the great question on which the War has turned, my opinion is, that they do not leave us at liberty to conclude a treaty without a relinquishment on the part of the enemy of the pretension complained of. Still I do not believe, in the actual condition of things, that if the continuance of the War depended upon that single point, the American Government would persist in their demand of the abandonment of what is now a mere theoretic pretension, the practical evil having for the present ceased; and if I were persuaded that the interests of our Country demanded of me the personal risk of a violation of instructions I should not hesitate to incur it. But the determination of this question depends on the enquiry whether *now* or a few months hence, when we could certainly hear from home, is the most favorable time for us to negotiate. A more unfavorable moment than the present certainly never could occur, and in this statement you appear to concur, as every [other?] person must. Will the condition be worse a few months hence? On the other side of the Atlantic every thing we hear is cheering—the Creek war terminated[10]—10 millions of the loan filled on terms highly encouraging—rapid progress made on Ontario in the construction of vessels which will give us the ascendancy there; and every reasonable prospect, from these and other circumstances which I will not trouble you with enumerating, of a successful issue to the Campaign. I do not believe, whatever efforts the British Government may make, that they can throw any considerable force into America so as to affect materially the present Campaign. No treaty that we can now conclude can arrest the progress of this campaign.

[8] Crawford Transcripts, Library of Congress.

[9] From Gothenburg.

[10] By Jackson's victory at the Horseshoe Bend, March 29, 1814.

On this side of the Atlantic is the aspect of affairs likely, by the delay I have supposed, to become worse for us? I think, my dear Sir, affairs here are far from being settled. This Country (I mean the Low Countries) appears to be about to be occupied by the British. For what? It will at least as to us have the effect of giving occupation to a portion of that force which might be sent agt. us. We know that all the great interests of Germany are unsettled. Altho' peace has been made, all the difficult points seem to have been put over to the Congress at Vienna. Is even France, conquered France, satisfied? When she has heaved from her bosom the immense foreign armies that now weigh her down, and her own shall have taken their place, will she not seek to efface the disgrace which her Arms have incurred?

If the negotiation is brought to the single issue, all other questions being disposed of, that we must now, without waiting to hear from America, sign a treaty, waiving the relinquishment of the pretension of impressment, I confess I should pause before I consented to a total rupture of the negotiation. But, my friend, it appears to me, holding the opinion that I do, on the subject of a short delay, that it will be our interest so to manage the negotiation as to take advantage in the turn of events here or at home. I should like to have your views on this matter, which it is not necessary to add, would have great influence with me. I confess I am inclined to think that the British Government will have no difficulty in making a peace leaving Impres't untouched. They will doubtless set up many claims—they will lay their d[emands?], but rely upon it ultimately (and that even without any change here or in America) they will be content to cast us and make us go hence etc. Why shd. they not? Undoubtedly, if we say nothing about impressment, they triumph in the contest.

As to acknowledging their right, our governmt. would neither permit us to sign, nor would I ever sign, a treaty embracing such a stipulation.

Mr. Wilson's project is very much that which Mr. Jeffrey, Editor of the E. Review,[11] when in America, suggested. Altho' it would probably be better for the victims of this tyranny than the existing practice, my opinion is that as it respects the nation, it is not a subject of compromise —there is no midway point on which honor can rest between abandonment of the practice, and total silence in relation to it.

I agree heartily with you that if we can make no peace it is a solemn duty enjoined by our situations so to conduct the negociation as to satisfy the nation that a vigorous and united exertion alone will preserve it.

I thank you for your attention to my request relative to my purposed visit to Paris, and to my friend Mr. Carrol.[12] I long much to see you, but I cannot yet say when I shall have that gratification.

This place is quite comfortable, infinitely more so than Gottenburg. But what think you of our being surrounded by a British garrison?

I confide this letter, which I shd. not trust to the mail, to Mr. Connell, whom I have found a genuinely intelligent and confidential American.

Yr. [*illegible*]
H Clay
1814

[11] *Edinburgh Review*; Francis Jeffrey.
[12] Mr. Carroll was Clay's private secretary.

IV. Bayard to Andrew Bayard.[13]

Ghent 6 August 1814.

My dear Andrew

Since my arrival in this place which was on the 27th of June I have had the pleasure to receive your letter of the 22d of March. You rightly remark that when one is far removed from home, that nothing is more grateful than communications from our friends. During the Six months that I remained at St. Petersberg the only letters I received from the U. States were one from you and one from my son Richard[14] and they were written shortly after I had left the Country. In fact more than a year had elapsed before I received a line from my wife, tho I did not doubt what I have since found to be true that she had written to me frequently. I wrote to you from Amsterdam, since which time I have visited London and Paris.

I arrived in London for an American at a very inauspicious moment.[15] The allies were at Paris and they had just received the news of the abdication of Bonaparte. The whole nation were delirious with joy which was not indulged without bitter invectives against their remaining enemies the Americans. The time of declaring the war had stung them more than the act itself. They considered it as an aid given to their great enemy at a moment when his power was most gigantic and most seriously threatened the subjugation of the continent as well as of themselves. They thirst for a great revenge and the nation will not be satisfied without it. They know little of our Parties. It was America that fell upon them at the crisis of their struggle and it is America now that is to be made to feel the weight of their undivided power. Such is the public voice but what the British Cabinet may think wise or prudent to be done, I can as yet collect only from distant and doubtful inferences.

Nothing favorable can be augured from the delay in sending their Commissioners to the rendezvous agreed to at their instance as the seat of the negociation. Our Commissioners have *all* been here more than a month and we have not yet heard that theirs are even preparing to quit London. We expect them daily, but so we have done for twenty days past, and so we shall do till they arrive, or till we learn that they do not mean to come at all.

I assure you between ourselves, my hopes of peace are very slender. The government of England affect to despise us, but they know that we are a growing and dangerous rival. If they could crush us at the present moment they would not fail to do it. And I am inclined to think that they will not make peace, till they have tried the effect of all their force against us. An united firm and couragious resistance upon our part alone in my opinion can furnish hopes of a safe and honorable peace to the United States.

I wish I could present you with different views but what does it avail to deceive ourselves? By shutting our eyes upon danger we may cease to see it, while in fact we are encreasing it. What I doubt is that if the olive branch be presented to us by one hand, a cup of humiliation and

[13] Bayard Papers. Andrew Bayard (1762–1833), an eminent merchant of Philadelphia, was a first cousin of James A. Bayard, being the son, while James was the nephew and foster-son, of Colonel John Bayard of the Revolutionary army.

[14] The eldest son, Richard Henry Bayard, U. S. senator 1836–1845.

[15] Bayard and Gallatin reached London, from Holland, on April 9.

disgrace will be held out in the other and altho I should rejoice to carry the former to the U. States, yet I shall never consent to be the Bearer of the latter.

Farewell my dear Andrew. I wish you and your family all manner of prosperity and happiness and beg you will all accept the assurance of my best and warmest friendship.

J. A. B.

P. S. *August 20.*[16] The British Commissioners have been here since the 6th. inst. and we have had several conferences. At the last such terms were prescribed as put an end to all hopes of peace. Nothing has been said about Maritime rights nor in fact has any former point of dispute been brought into question. The sovereignty of the lakes and large cessions of territory etc are the price demanded for peace. If the terms proposed are not acceded to, the negociation is to end. The terms will certainly be rejected and the negociation will terminate in a few days.

J. A. B.

V. Clay to Crawford.[17]

Ghent 11th Aug. 1814.

My Dear Crawford,

The deep interest you have taken, and I have no doubt continue to feel, in the result of our negotiation induces me to communicate to you the present state of it, as briefly as possible, reserving for a future occasion more ample details.

The British C[ommissioners] are *instructed* to *insist* upon as a *sine qua non to the conclusion of any treaty of peace that the pacification* shall include the *Indian allies* of *G*[reat] *B*[ritain]; and that an *Indian boundary* shall be *fixed* by the *treaty, setting* apart a *country for them to create a permanent barrier between* the *British provinces* and the *U S with*[in?] *which neither* the *U S nor G. B.* are to be *at liberty* to *purchase* from the *Indians.*

They have further informed us that the *rights* of *fishing* etc. within the *jurisdiction* of *G. B.* which were granted to *America* by the *Treaty* of *peace* will *not* be *continued* without *an equivalent.*

They have asked if we are instructed on those *two* points, to which *we* answered in the negative. Nevertheless *we* expressed a willingness to take up those subjects, with the other matters of negotiation, and receive the *British* views upon them, and to communicate *our own* in *return.* This *they* declined doing, without *we* would give, what *we would not give,* an assurance that a *discussion* might lead to some *provisional article* which we would agree upon *subject* to the *future decision* of *our government.* In this state of things, *they* have *referred* the *subject* to *their government* for its *further orders,* and in the mean time *our conferences* are *suspended.*

From the expressions and manner of the B[ritish] C[ommissioners] I inferred a willingness on their part to *pass over* in *silence* if we were

[16] This postscript is found among the Bayard Papers detached from the letter to which it belongs, but is believed to belong to the letter of August 6 to Andrew Bayard.

[17] Crawford Transcripts, Library of Congress. The words here printed in italics are in cipher in the original.

willing to do so, *the subject of impressment.* This we are *now* authorized *eventually* to do by our late instructions.[18]

I think it probable that the B. C. will be *instructed* to *persist* in their *sine qua non* with the view of getting us to *refer* the subject to *our government.* On such a state of things an important question will arise, upon which I should like to have your opinion, Shall we *break off the negociation?*

I recd. your kind letter by Mr. Myers. I shall never cease to retain the most lively sense of your very friendly offer in relation to myself. Upon that and other subjects I will hereafter communicate with you.

The John Adams will sail in the course of ten or twelve days, if we receive her passport, now daily expected from London. You will do well to prepare the despatches which I presume you intend to expedite by her.

The B. C. have taken a house in town.

Yr friend,
H Clay

P. S. The cypher used is that of which Mr. S. informs me he lately furnished you a Copy.

VI. Bayard to Robert Goodloe Harper.[19]

Ghent 19 August 1814

My dear Harper,

I know you would wish me to answer the question "are you likely to make peace or is the war to continue." Let me tell you, that this question is as doubtful at Ghent at present as it can be at Baltimore. It depended solely upon Us to make the war, but there is another Party to consult in making peace.

In forming your calculations on the subject, you will confine your considerations to the motives solely which Great Britain may be supposed to have to continue the war. Knowing the terms upon which we are authorized to make peace and are disposed to make it, you would say in one moment if these are not acceded to, "let the fate of battles decide the conditions to which we must submit".

If the war continues it is no longer the war of our administration It will be in its character as well as in its operations a defensive war. The views of the British Cabinet are undoubtedly altered by the great changes which have taken place on this Continent. While the power of Bonaparte existed Great Britain had employment for all her resources on this side of the Atlantic.

The war with America was embarrassing and caused a serious diversion of her forces. She then wanted peace and would have made it upon terms not wholly satisfactory to Herself. At present there is no Power in this Hemisphere from which she has anything to dread. She has been vexed for many years by the disputes we have had with Her with

[18] Monroe to the commissioners, June 25, 1814. *Am. St. P., For. Rel.,* III. 703–704.

[19] Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Dreer Collection, American Lawyers, vol. I. Endorsed as received October 12, 1814. Robert Goodloe Harper, Federalist representative from South Carolina 1795–1801, senator from Maryland 1816–1821, had been a colleague and was an intimate friend of Bayard. At this time he was practising law in Baltimore.

respect to her maritime rights. She is jealous of the encreasing resources of our country, of the aptitude of our people for commerce and navigation and their prowess in naval enterprize. She sees at the present moment a state of things which may never occur again, in which she is left without an apprehension of the interference of Any European Power to exert her whole strength against Us. The effort will be made to crush Us altogether and if that be impracticable to inflict such wounds as will put a stop to our growth or at least retard it.

August 20th. While writing to you yesterday I was interrupted by a message from the British Commissioners who desired to have an interview with Us.

Our conferences had been suspended for several days in consequence of their having requested time to send a Courier to London before they proceeded further. The Courier had returned in the morning, and brought the Ultimatum.[20]

At this meeting the veil with which they had attempted before to cover their designs was thrown aside. Their terms were those of a Conqueror to a conquered People. The former points of dispute have not been the Subjects of a moments consideration. Maritime pretensions have been thrown far in the back ground and concessions of the most ruinous and disgraceful description have been required.

I trust in God that when the character of the war is so totally changed and when we are not simply contending for the honor of the nation but driven to fight for its existence, the Federalists will prove themselves, what I have always believed them to be, the true and faithful friends of their Country. As to the origin of the war we are all agreed. But when peace is refused upon just and moderate terms and the most extrava[ga]nt pretensions are advanced, what is left for Us but to fight manfully or submit to disgrace and ruin.

The negociation is not absolutely ended, but little more remains than the form of closing it.

I thought I owed to you this communication from the confidence which has always subsisted between Us on political subjects.

Believe me my dear Harper
with sentiments of great esteem and regard
Your friend and obt. Sert.

J. A. Bayard

Robert G. Harper Esqr.

VII. Adams to Crawford.[21]

W. H. Crawford Esqr.
Minister Plenipotentiary U. S. Paris.

Ghent 29 August, 1814.

Dear Sir,

I scarcely know how to apologize to you, for having yet to reply to your favour of 12 July, which was received by me on the 16th. The

[20] See the note of the British commissioners, August 19. *Am. St. P., For. Rel.*, III. 710.

[21] Crawford Transcripts, Library of Congress. The letter will also be printed, presumably from Adams's draft, in Mr. Ford's *Writings of John Quincy Adams*, vol. V. The italics of the concluding lines represent words in cipher.

simple fact has been, that being without the assistance of a Secretary, and having to dispatch by the John Adams the return of nearly a year's correspondence from our own Country, I postponed from day to day the reply due to you, merely because it could at any day be transmitted, until several weeks have elapsed, leaving the duty still to be performed.

I have been the less scrupulous in performing it sooner, because I have known that some of our Colleagues were more punctual, and particularly that our excellent friend, Mr Clay, had kept you well informed of the progress of our Negotiation.

The result has been such as was to be expected. It is natural that we should feel, and we do all feel a deep disappointment at the failure of the attempt to restore to our Country the blessings of Peace; especially as by changing the grounds upon which the War is to be continued, Great Britain has opened to us the alternative of a long, expensive and sanguinary War, or of submission to disgraceful conditions, and sacrifices little short of Independence itself. It is the crisis which must try the temper of our Country. If the dangers which now hang over our heads, should intimidate our People into the Spirit of concession, if the temper of compounding for sacrifices should manifest itself in any strength, there will be nothing left us worth defending. But if our Countrymen are not all degenerate, if there is a drop of the blood flowing in their veins that carried their fathers through the Revolutionary War, the prolongation of hostilities will only be to secure to us ultimately a more glorious triumph. I have not so ill an opinion of them as to believe they will sink immediately in the struggle before them: but I wish the real Statesmen among us may form what I fear very few of them have yet formed, a true estimate of our Condition. I wish them to look all our dangers in the face, and to their full extent. The rupture of this Negotiation not only frustrates all hope of Peace for the present year, but at least also for the next. All the present preparations in England are calculated for operation the next Campaign. The forces they have sent out already, and those they are about to dispatch are so large, and composed of such troops that they *must* in the first instance make powerful impressions, and obtain brilliant successes. The actual state of things both in Europe and America, as well as the experience of our former War, proves this to as full demonstration as if the official Accounts were already published in the London Gazette. The Spirit that is prepared for disaster is least likely to be broken down by it when it comes. We must not flatter ourselves with delusive estimates of our dangers, and we must expect to pass through the career of British triumph and exultation at our Calamities, before we can lead them to the result that they bring our enemy no nearer to his object than his defeats.

Mr. Russell and myself have received an instruction of the same tenour from the Secretary of State to make a representation against Cochran's proclamation of blocade of twenty fifth April last.[22] *I suppose you must have received a similar instruction. It would be gratifying and perhaps useful for us to know whether this is the case, and if so, whether you have done anything under the instructions, and generally what are the views of this subject entertained at the present court of France.*

You are instructed that we have rejected the preliminary sine qua

22 Proclamation printed in Niles, VI. 182.

non to which the adverse party has adhered. We are only waiting for their official reply and shall not remain here beyond a week or ten days.

I am with respect etc

J. Qu. Adams

P. S. 31 Augt. The John Adams sailed from the Texel on Sunday. *The B*[ritish] *P*[lenipotentiarie]*s have referred our note to their government.* I entreat a line from you by return of the mail if you duly receive this Letter.

VIII. Crawford to the Commissioners.[23]

Paris 13th Sept. 1814

Their Excellencies
The Envoys of the United States
at Ghent

Gentlemen

The English newspapers continue to speculate on the probable result of the negotiation. They assert that you have submitted a counter-project and have demanded an armistice by sea and land until it shall have been definitively accepted or rejected. I can hardly believe that the negotiation has taken this direction. I cannot conceive how with a sine qua non, which closed the door of discussion at the very threshold of the negotiation, you can have had the address to present to the consideration of the British Envoys, questions which they had determined not to discuss. If this is the case the views of the British ministry must materially have changed since the commencement of the negotiation. Perhaps I can give a clue to the labyrinth in which you may be involved. Erick Bolman is now at Paris.[24] He came direct from England with a letter from Arbuthnot,[25] a subordinate member of the British ministry, to Lord Castlereagh. He follows him to Vienna. This philosophic and science-loving man, it seems, has undertaken a voyage from the United States to impart to the chymists and mecanicians of Europe his discoveries in rendering zinc maleable, and is going to Austria, which he has been forbidden to enter, and where patents have never been granted, to establish steam-boats on the Danube. This man asserts that he had an interview, the first of this month, with A—— at which Vansitart[26] was to have been present, but was prevented by business. He says that he insisted upon the necessity of making peace with the United States, upon liberal terms, and that if the war was continued on account of the extravagant demands of England that all parties will be united, and the expectations of the ministry completely disappointed. That this course will effectually put down the federal party and exalt the present administration. That the latter has always contended that the British nation was jealous of the

[23] Russell Papers, Library of Brown University.

[24] Erick Bollman (1769–1821), the German physician who made himself famous by the rescue of Lafayette from prison at Olmütz, and then, migrating to America, was implicated in Burr's conspiracy in 1806, as Burr's agent in New Orleans. The Bayard Papers contain several letters from him of about this time.

[25] No doubt Charles Arbuthnot (1767–1850), secretary to the Treasury.

[26] Nicholas Vansittart (1766–1851), chancellor of the exchequer, afterward Lord Bexley.

prosperity of the United States, and sought every occasion to destroy it, while the other party had a more favourable opinion of her amity; That the further prosecution of the war will verify all the assertions of the former and disappoint all the expectations of the latter. He represented himself as the enemy of the administration and desirous of removing them from power. Being a Hanoverian by birth, and inimical to the republican party, he conceives gave his representations more weight than those which the ministry are in the habit of receiving. He contrived that this interview should be sought by the ministry. Mr. A—— appeared to be convinced by his statements and reasoning, and expressed a strong desire that he would see lord C—— and make the same communication to him. For this purpose the letter, previously mentioned, was written. This is the history which he has given under circumstances which induce me to believe that he intended it should reach me. In stating to a friend of his in this city that the further prosecution of the war would unite all parties and call into activity all the talents of the country he suggested the probability of Colo. Burr's employment in a military capacity. This suggestion naturally presents to the mind the probability that he may yet be the infatuated tool of that restless and unprincipled man. That he has had an interview with Mr. R. A.[27] I readily believe, that if the nature of the demands which have been made in the negotiation were disclosed to him he remonstrated against them and endeavoured to convince the ministry that they were defeating their own views, may reasonably be admitted; but it is highly improbable that he made any exertions to promote the interests of the United States. This I can hardly believe. He expressed a hope that he had done something for America and says that the Neptune has not been ordered to Brest as was intended. This he attributes to a change of views in the British Cabinet effected by his representations. Haec credeat Judaes appella sed non ego.[28] I cannot give credit to this zinc and steam boat story. I cannot believe that this is the reason that induces him to expose his person to the danger which he would incur by venturing to Vienna unprotected by the British ministry. No—the thing is impossible. He is the minister of mischief to the United States. If my conjectures are correct you will be kept in a state of suspence or will be amused with various projects and devices until the propositions with which he is charged shall have been decided. Believing as I do that your exertions cannot be successful and that the negotiation cannot be broken off upon propositions more favourable to the interest of our country than upon their sine qua non I shall rejoice to hear of your leaving Ghent.

With my best wishes for the success of your efforts accept those for your individual happiness.

Wm. H. Crawford.

IX. Clay to Crawford.[29]

Ghent 17th Oct. 1814

I wish, my dear Crawford, it were possible to pass over in silence, and bury in oblivion, the distressing events which have occurred at home.[30]

27 Probably meaning Mr. *Charles* Arbuthnot, as above.
28 Meaning "Haec credat Judaeus Apella", etc.
29 Crawford Transcripts, Library of Congress.
30 The capture of Washington, August 24–25, and ensuing events.

But it would be in vain to attempt to conceal that they have given me the deepest affliction. The enemy it is true has lost much in character, at least in the estimation of the impartial world. And the loss of public property gives me comparatively no pain. What does wound me to the very soul is, that a set of pirates and incendiaries should have been permitted to pollute our soil, conflagrate our Capital, and return unpunished to their ships! No consolation is afforded us by the late intelligence from America. It appears that by the unfortunate failure of Chauncey to co-operate with Brown, the campaign is lost, and we are compelled every where to act upon the defensive.[31] Drummond, who I thought was caught, will escape, if he does not take Gains; and consequently Chauncey's whole flotilla is seriously endangered. I tremble indeed whenever I take up a late newspaper. Hope alone sustains me!

My last letter apprized you that we had rejected the proposition, made a sine qua non, to include the Indians in the peace, as the allies of G. Britain, and expressed the expectation that a rupture of the negotiation, or an abandonment of the principle by the other party must probably ensue. Neither alternative has occurred. Still coming down, they have changed again their ground, and sent in an article of which the enclosed is a Copy, which they declared to be their ultimatum,[32] and that upon our acceptance of it depended their remaining in Ghent. As this article strips their principle of some of its most exceptionable features, and as we did not like a rupture upon such ground, especially as it was highly probable that the article itself would be inoperative by a previous pacification of the Indians, we concluded to accept it, with the full knowledge by the other party that our Government, having given no instructions on the subject, was free to adopt or reject it. We wished at the same time the presentation to us, of a projet of a treaty, offering immediately after to furnish a counter-projet. Our answer to this report was delivered on friday last,[33] and we have since been informally told that it has been sent to London, and that no reply will be given until the return of the messenger, which will be about the first of next week.

There is much reason to believe that the other party has aimed to protract the negotiation here so as to make it subservient to his views at Vienna. Under this persuasion I urged the propriety of placing the true state and prospects of the whole business in possession of the French and Russian Governments; and had actually prepared a letter which was agreed to be sent to you from the mission. But the complexion of the last note seems to render this course somewhat questionable, especially at this late period, and when there is so little reason to hope for co-operation from any part of Europe.

We have however deemed it eligible, in consonance with views entertained by the Govt. when I left America, in relation to a Congress which it was supposed would be held upon the Rhine, to send Mr.

[31] Clay accepts Brown's view of the matter, as expressed in his letter of July 13 to Chauncey; but see Henry Adams, *History*, VIII. 46, 81. The allusions which follow are, of course, to the disappointing termination of the Niagara campaign.

[32] The article enclosed in the note of the British commissioners of October 8. *Am. St. P., For. Rel.*, III. 723.

[33] *Ibid.* The American note is there dated as of October 13 (Thursday), but was in fact sent the next day. Adams, *Memoirs*, III. 53.

Shaler[34] to Vienna to collect what information he can. He will go in no official character, and will observe all practicable secrecy. If you can furnish him any letters calculated to promote the object of his mission or can facilitate, after arriving at Vienna, his correspondence with us, you will oblige us. Perhaps this latter aid may be obtained through the French couriers.

You have been apprized of the 25th inst being fixed for the sailing of the Chauncey. I think it probable that it may be a day or two later.

I hope my omitting to communicate heretofore to you my decision as to the mission which you fill[35] has subjected you to no inconvenience; indeed I cannot suppose that any such effect could happen. When you first mentioned your kind offer to me I expected very soon to be with you in Paris, and hence delayed making it. I find, by a letter which Mr. Boyd[36] brought me, that the District I formerly represented in Congress has again returned me. I cannot therefore accept of any situation which would disable me from fulfilling the expectations of those who have so honorably noticed me. Had not that event occurred Europe has no attractions for me sufficient to detain me here beyond the termination of my present duties or to bring me back again, when I shall be so happy as once more to see our native land.[37]

P. S. Since writing the preceding,
we have abandoned the intention of
sending Mr. Shaler.[38]

H. C.

By his Excy. Leave I have
the honour to add the assurances
of my most sincere and friendly regard.
I wish to God, I was in Paris with
Yr. Excellency.

C. Hughes Jr.[39]

X. Adams to Crawford.[40]

W. H. Crawford Esqr., Paris.

Ghent 18 October 1814

Dear Sir,

I had the pleasure of writing to you on the 5th inst. since which Mr. Gallatin has received your favour of the 6th, forwarded from Lille by Mr. Baker,[41] who was detained there by illness. Mr. Boyd will be the bearer of this.

Since I wrote you last, the Negotiation here has apparently taken a turn, which induces a postponement of the joint communication which I then gave you reason to expect. I am convinced with you that Great

[34] William Shaler, afterward U. S. consul-general at Algiers and at Havana, was an attaché of the mission.

[35] Crawford wished to return to the United States, and in fact left his Paris mission at the end of April, 1815.

[36] George Boyd, Adams's brother-in-law. The letter was from Mrs. Clay. Adams, *Memoirs*, III. 43.

[37] Clay's signature has been cut from the letter.

[38] See Adams, *Memoirs*, III. 55.

[39] Christopher Hughes of Baltimore was the secretary of the mission.

[40] Crawford Transcripts, Library of Congress.

[41] Presumably Anthony St. John Baker, secretary of the British mission.

Britain keeps this negotiation open, to further views of policy, which she is promoting at Vienna, but I think she has the further object of availing herself of the impression she expects to make in America during the present campaign, and of the terrors she is holding out for the next. As our remaining here must have a tendency to countenance weakness and indecision on the other side of the atlantic, I sincerely regret that the negotiation has not yet been brought to a close. But to close it has not been in our power. That is to say, there has never been a moment, when we should have been justified in breaking it off, or could have shewn to the world the real policy of Great Britain. By referring every communication from us to their government before they replied to it the British Plenipotentiaries have done their part to consume time; and by varying their propositions upon every answer from us, their Government have done the same. We have at length accepted their article, and asked them for their Projet of a Treaty. We expect their reply on Monday or Tuesday next. The present aspect is of a continuance of the Negotiation, and we are not warranted in saying to France or Russia, that we believe nothing will come of it. We are all ready enough to indulge hopes, but I see no reason for changing the belief that we have constantly entertained. My only apprehension from delay is that the firmness of our own Councils at home, may not be kept up to the tone which has characterised them heretofore. If they stand the test, we shall have no Peace now, but a very good one hereafter.

I am, Dear Sir, very respectfully yours[42]

XI. Bayard to Andrew Bayard.[43]

Ghent 26 Octr. 1814.

My dear Andrew

I had the pleasure to receive your letter by Mr. Bollman dated in July. That and one from Caroline are the only letters I have received since Feby from home.

I expected when I wrote to you by the John Adams to have been at this time near the coast of America.

Not one of us then expected that the negotiation would have continued ten days, and at present not one of us can tell at what time or in what way it will end.

It has clearly been the policy of the British Government to avoid a rupture and to protract for that purpose the discussions. With the same views she created the delays which attended the opening the negotiation.

She was influenced by two motives. 1st. To see the effect of the armaments she had sent to the U. States. 2d. To ascertain the probable result of the proceedings at Vienna.

They certainly did expect that the force sent to America would in the course of the campaign strike a blow which would prostrate the nation at her feet. Whether in that event she would have been satisfied with dictating the terms of an ignominious peace I think very doubtful. it is more likely that she would have been encouraged to aim at complete subjugation. The Capture of Washington was a source of great triumph and exultation and inspired a belief that their troops could not be resisted. This error has been sadly corrected by the repulse in the attack

[42] Signature missing.

[43] Bayard Papers.

upon Baltimore, by the destruction of their fleet on lake Champlain and by the retreat of Prevost from Plattsburg.

No people are more easily elated or depressed by events than the English. We have nothing to hope for but from vigorous and successful measures, so far as the war depends upon ourselves alone. The British force in America must be over come and repelled or the war must end in national disgrace.

Something however is to be expected from the proceedings of the Congress at Vienna.

The french Minister Prince Talleyrand (a new title)[44] has delivered in a strong note which contains a protest on the part of France against the aggrandizement of the other Powers of Europe, while France is confined to her limits of 1792.

It is stated also that it requires that all material questions regarding maritime rights, should be settled by the Congress as equally essential to the peace of Europe as the regulation of territorial pretensions. This note is said to have produced a strong sensation at Vienna and will not fail to excite a corresponding one at London.

If Great Britain thinks it likely that she will in any form be involved in a continental war, she will hasten to make peace with us.

Thus in a great measure does our destiny depend upon operations not under our controle, nor within our view.

There is no probability of an immediate rupture of the negotiations. However disposed the British Government may be to prosecute the War, They will not abandon the means of making peace, if the course of European affairs should render it expedient.

Knowing her policy our conduct has been regulated accordingly. But it is quite possible for her, with no intention finally to make peace, to protract the negotiation for months to come.

I have given up all hopes of returning to the United States this winter. Our ship, the Neptune, is ordered to Brest, as it was not safe to allow her to winter at Antwerp which is commanded by a British force.

I paid a visit a few days ago to Bergen op Zoom which is about 55 miles from this place. It is strongly fortified but was weakly garrisoned when assaulted in March last by the British.[45] The garrison consisted of 2300 young troops, and the town was entered by 2800 British soldiers, the greater part of whom were killed or made prisoners. Many marks of the battle remain upon the trees and houses.

It is quite possible that I may spend some weeks in Paris before the season arrives at which we should be willing to undertake our voyage home, Tho I assure you my taste is so bad that I would infinitely rather find myself in Wilmington than Paris.

I beg to be remembered to all my Cousins who compose your family and also to my relatives in Arch Street to whom I wish all manner of prosperity and happiness.

Adieu and believe me sincerely
yours

J. A. B.

P. S. Do not commit me
in any use of this letter.

[44] Talleyrand had been Prince of Benevento since 1806; but Louis XVIII. had lately made him Prince de Talleyrand.

[45] Sir Thomas Graham attempted to capture the place by a *coup de main*, but was disastrously repulsed by the French. Bayard, Gallatin and his son, and Hughes, went on this journey together. Adams, *Memoirs*, III. 56.

XII. CRAWFORD TO ADAMS.[46]

PARIS 26th Oct 1814

My dear Sir,

Mr Boyd arrived on Friday evening and delivered me the letters and packages which you and the other members of the Mission confided to him.

I have in some of my letters said, that if any reliance could be placed upon the sincerity of the British ministry, that a peace is not impracticable. The declaration was made before I knew their last ultimatum. That paper strengthens this conjectural opinion, but still I agree with you that peace is an improbable result. I have no confidence in their sincerity. If they make peace upon the basis now proposed it will be because they have been wholly disappointed in the result of the campaign. It has afforded me the most heartfelt satisfaction to find myself mistaken. The campaign has been much more successful than I had anticipated.

The aspect of affairs now is highly consolatory and encouraging. I hope that Drummond has been Burgoyned in the course of the last month. If this has been done, the campaign will have a brilliant conclusion. The superiority which this event will give to our arms will overbalance the temporary loss of the naval superiority during the last month of the campaign. This superiority however may not be lost. I hope it will not be.

The spirit which the destruction of Washington has excited is generally what it ought to be. Boston will defend itself. Massachusetts will assist her sister states, tho with an air somewhat ungracious. The demon of disunion, and of separation, upon which the enemy have constantly calculated, is about to hide its execrable form. The delusive dreams of conquest, and of separating the States, which have had more or less influence upon the councils of the Prince Regent, will now be entirely broken. The war will shortly become a mere question of interest, of cold calculation. This will give form and consistency to the opposition, if not in the approaching, at least in the Spring, session of Parliament. The nation will then discover that the war taxes must be continued, and that loans must be made, or the surplus of the sinking fund must be diverted from its legitimate object, to meet the current expenses of the year. This will be an unpleasant discovery for Johnny Bull, and cannot fail to produce much dissatisfaction. Admitting that the objects for which the war is to be prosecuted may embrace concessions which will be gratifying to the national pride, and beneficial to their naval superiority, yet it cannot fail to occur to the thinking part of the nation, that these concessions, if obtained, must be temporary in their enjoyment. They must be sensible, that the moment is rapidly approaching when the shackles which force may have imposed, will by force be broken. That it is indeed possible that this period may arrive, even before they have derived any benefit from it. For it is only when she is Belligerent, that these concessions will be useful to her. Should she therefore remain twenty years at peace, she will have prosecuted this war for the attainment of objects, which the greatest possible success could alone give her, and eventually derive no benefit from them. In that time we shall be able, in conjunction with her adversary, to shake off the unequal and hard conditions, which she may have imposed upon us. For myself, I

[46] Adams Papers.

agree entirely with you, that we shall have a good peace, if the war is prosecuted a year or two longer.

I have never looked forward to the ultimate issue of the war, with despondency. The spirit which has burst forth in every part of the nation would be sufficient to dispel every doubt if any has heretofore existed upon the subject.

With sentiments of the highest esteem I am dear Sir your most obedient

and very humble servant

WM. H. CRAWFORD.

His Excellency John Q. Adams.

XIII. CRAWFORD TO ADAMS.[47]

PARIS 10th Nov 1814

Dear Sir

Your favor of the 6th inst has been this moment recd. Mr Storer who will deliver you this, will be able to give you the news of this place.

I have uniformly believed that the transactions at Vienna, would ultimately decide the result of your efforts. The B.[48] ministry no doubt expected that the events of the Campaign would come in aid of their demands, but their ultimate decision was intended from the first to be regulated by the transactions at Vienna. Common report says that the Congress is likely to arrange nothing. The fall in the funds during the last days is attributed to this impression. I confess I place no confidence in these rumors. The affairs of the Continent will be arranged, if not satisfactorily, at least in such manner as to avoid hostilities. If so, I think our struggle must be continued for several campaigns to come. We cannot fail to obtain an honorable peace, if we are true to ourselves. I have never looked forward with dismay to the ultimate issue of the contest. It appears to me that the capture of Drummond has been effected, unless there has been misconduct in the field, by want of foresight and decision in the Cabinet. The moment that our superiority was established upon Lake Ontario, the capture of Drummond and his army became practicable. It ought to have been attempted, even at the hazard of loosing Sackett's harbor. If Izzard has been sent against Kingston instead of being sent to the other end of the lake, it is probable that the enterprise will fail, and Drummond will escape. Kingston must be fortified so as to require a regular siege. Prevost can bring a superior force to its relief, before regular approaches can be made, and the enterprise must prove abortive. It is hardly possible that this view of the subject should not have presented itself to the Cabinet.

If your negotiation continues until the government puts an end to it, you will remain at Ghent until next May. The President will be induced to believe, from the complexion of your first dispatches, that the negotiation is long since at an end.

The dispatches which you will receive in reply, if you receive any, will hardly contain instructions to do what the government will suppose to have been long since accomplished.

[47] Adams Papers.

[48] British. The generals mentioned below are, of course, Lieutenant-General Gordon Drummond, Major-General George Izard, and Sir George Prevost, governor-general of Canada.

It is possible that the reply to your dispatches sent by the Chauncey, may produce some such instructions. At present I see no other obstacle to peace, but what arises from a conviction, that what has already been done, has not been done with good faith. The express consent given to wave the question of impressment, and the abandonment of Indian barrier, and the military possession of the lakes, appears to me to remove the principle obstacles to peace. It is not likely that they will break off the negotiation by adhering to the basis of the uti possidetis. If they do, they have less understanding, than I have hitherto supposed they possess.

In my letter to Mr Russell this morning, which I sent by mail, without knowing of the departure of Mr Storer, I have possibly expressed myself too strongly, and unguardedly, upon the equivalent which he appeared to think would be offered for the fisheries. I may not understand the question, or I may have overlooked the reasons which have weighed with you. However this may be, I assure you that my confidence in the intelligence and correctness of the views of every member of the Commission is so great, that I shall distrust the correctness of my own judgement if it happens to be different from theirs.

I am dear Sir with sentiments of respect, your most ob't and very humble

Serv't

Wm. H. Crawford.

His Ex'y John Q. Adams.

XIV. Russell to Crawford.[49]

Ghent 23d December 1814.

My dear Sir,

I have had the pleasure of receiving your letter and note of the 12t and the dispatches for the united states which accompanied them and which shall be forwarded in the manner you suggest.

In noticing the diversity of opinion which may occasionally occur, on particular points, between the members of the mission to which I belong, and which undoubtedly arises from the difference of the impression which the same circumstances make on different men however sincerely united in the pursuit of the same ultimate object, I by no means set up for infallibility or am over-confident that the course of which I may be the advocate, is the best. I am still farther from intending to insinuate any reproach against the patriotism, or integrity or intelligence of my colleagues because I happen to be so unfortunate as not to accord with them in my view of all the subjects, which, in the course of this negotiation, are presented for discussion. My only object in communicating to you these things is to make you better acquainted with the character of our proceedings, to show you that both sides of a question have been examined, and to profit of your information and advice, if to be obtained in season to influence the final decision.

There are so many agents in forming the opinions and producing the convictions of a man, besides his reason, that his argument, however sincere and plausible, may hold only a subordinate rank, and be but the instrument of constitutional infirmity, prepossession or prejudice.

The texture of the nerves is a great thing even with great men and

[49] Crawford Transcripts, Library of Congress. See note 3, above.

the fear or the firmness that results from it may have more concern in giving a direction to the policy of an able statesman than his understanding.

Great irritability of fibre is still more dangerous. It sports with the judgment and sometimes with the character of its victim. It betrays him into inconsistency and extravagance and, after raising him into flights of eccentricity and perhaps of eloquence, leaves him a prey to error and absurdity. If this unfortunate man should, at the same time, be tainted with family pride or infected with the conceit of literary acquirement or of local importance, his reasoning faculties and his patriotism are necessarily circumscribed within very narrow limits and he is liable to mistake the tasteless ostentation of pedantry for science, and his little personal pretensions and the notions of his vicinage for the great interests of his country.[50]

The influence of habit and of education is also unsafe and the wisest and best of men may in vain believe themselves free from the prejudices it necessarily engenders. A long cooperation with a party or a sect imbues the very soul with their colour and whatever purity we may affect, or sincerely endeavour to attain, we still give the same tinge to every thing which we touch. A professional education is, likewise, apt to impose fetters on the mind and to give a mechanical and artificial character even to our reasoning. The tanner believed that leather was the best material for fortifications and the common-lawyer will cite, authoritatively, a black-letter maxim as a clincher on a point of public right.

Aware of these and other frailties of human nature, if I am disposed, perhaps, to distrust too much the opinions of others, I am taught a salutary diffidence in my own. When, however, I encounter a man, in whose heart all the nobler passions have found their home, and whose head is unobscured by the fogs [of] a false education, whose great object is the welfare of his country and who pursues this object with an instinctive good sense that never deceives, I listen to him with unsuspecting confidence, and promptly accord to ingenuosness that implicit faith which I am apt to deny to mere ingenuity.

I pray you to excuse this sentimental excursion and I will now endeavour to make you amends by stating the sober details of business, which I am sure will be more interesting to you.

After my last letter to you of the 2nd we heard nothing from the British Plenips. until the 9th when Mr. Baker, their secretary, called on us to ask a conference for the next day. At this conference they informed us that their amendment to the first article could not be entirely withdrawn but they were willing so to modify it that it should apply only to the islands in Passamaquoddy bay. They gave us also to understand that all our propositions, as a substitute for their additional clause to the 8th article, were inadmissable. On their part however, they presented one (marked A) which you will find enclosed. They at the same time submitted to us for consideration two articles, one

[50] The above paragraph, it is hardly necessary to say, refers to Adams. The next refers to Bayard, Federalist and lawyer; the paragraph of compliment then ensuing, to Clay, apparently.

(marked B) relative to courts of law in the two countries, and the other (marked C) concerning the slave trade.[51]

On the 12th we had another conference at which much conversation took place, particularly concerning the amendments and propositions in relation to the first and eighth articles of our projet.

We contended that the principle of status ante bellum required the restitution of the Passamaquoddy islands and that to retain a possession acquired by force of arms was setting up a title from conquest. That to leave them in possession of those islands on their claim of previous right would be to make a special exception in favour of that right that might influence the tribunal to which its final decision was referred.

They asserted that the honour of Great Britain was concerned in this retention but were not very intelligible in the reasons they assigned for this assertion. They also mentioned, in a desultory way, some facts as evidence of their previous right.

With regard to the navigation of the Mississippi, and the liberty of taking and drying fish we were willing to leave them with the treaty of 1783, our construction considering the stipulations of that treaty, with respect to these points, to be unimpaired, and theirs considering them to be abrogated by the war. Both parties appeared willing to consent to a general provision to treat hereafter on these subjects, if conceived in terms that should neither recognize or prejudice their respective pretensions. Several essays at such a provision were made but not being mutually satisfactory in their results the conference ended without the adjustment of a single point.

We found the British Ministers were without authority even to expound the propositions which they made to us much less to modify them. Their office appears to be of a telegraphic character and they are not even allowed to understand the communications which they transmit.

On the 14th we presented a note of which (D) a copy is enclosed. The paper marked E is the clause therein referred to. This note of course was sent to London for an answer. This answer was received last evening. Our clause respecting the Passamaquoddy islands has been substantially agreed to, excepting the *limitation* of the present possession to years in case the right shall not within that time be decided, which has been expunged. The whole of the eighth article is to be omitted; and the free navigation of the Mississippi and the liberty of taking and curing fish, are left without any specific stipulation, depending on the respective declarations of the parties.

We shall receive the British Ministers at a conference, this day, to fill up the blanks, particularly those with respect to the limitation of capture at sea, and to arrange some of the formalities of the treaty. This done and fair copies of the treaty drawn up, it will be signed.

You have now before you the result of our labours. I will make no

[51] A, B, and C will all be found in the protocol of the conference of December 10. *Am. St. P., For. Rel.*, III. 743. The conference of that date is fully reported by Adams, *Memoirs*, III. 93–99, and that of December 12, *ibid.*, pp. 104–112. The note D and the paper E, mentioned below, and the answer to them, December 22, are in *Am. St. P., For. Rel.*, III. 743–745.

other comment that that I believe we have done the best, or nearly the best, which was practicable in existing circumstances.

I think I shall be at Paris in twelve or fifteen days.

very respectfully and faithfully
my dear sir
Your friend and obedient servant
JONA. RUSSELL.

I expect Mr. Todd[52] would have taken this to Paris but his movements are so uncertain that I have decided on sending it by mail under cover to Hottinguer and Co.

XV. WELLINGTON TO CRAWFORD.[53]

The Duke of Wellington presents his Compliments to Mr. Crauford and has the pleasure to inform him that he has just received a Dispatch from His Majesty's Plenipotentiaries at Ghent, in which they have informed the Duke that they had on the 24th Instant signed a Treaty of Peace and Amity with the plenipotentiaries of the United States

The Duke of Wellington congratulates Mr. Crauford upon an Event which restores the relations of Amity between States, which ought always to have been Friends, and the Duke takes this occasion of assuring Mr. Craufurd of his high consideration

PARIS ce Lundi 9 heures du Soir.

[52] Payne Todd, Mrs. Madison's son, was attached to the mission. Hottinguer and Company were Paris bankers.

[53] Crawford Transcripts, Library of Congress. The date must be December 26, 1814.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

BOOKS OF ANCIENT HISTORY

The Philistines: their History and Civilization. The Schweich Lectures for 1911. By R. A. STEWART MACALISTER, M.A., F.S.A. (London: Oxford University Press. 1913. Pp. iv, 136.)

UNTIL recently the Philistines were known only from mentions in the Old Testament and in classical writers, but in the course of the last twenty years much additional light has been thrown upon their history by archaeology. This new information Mr. Macalister seeks to gather up and to combine with the facts previously known concerning this interesting people in the lectures delivered before the British Academy on the Schweich Foundation in 1911, and now published in expanded form in this handsome volume. For this task Mr. Macalister (now professor of Celtic archaeology in the University of Dublin) is well qualified. He is a distinguished archaeologist and Orientalist, and for seven years was director of the excavation of the mound of Gezer for the Palestine Exploration Fund. Through his discoveries in this place (published in *The Excavation of Gezer*, 2 vols., 1912) he has added more to our knowledge of the Philistines than any other modern investigator. His book is the best work on this subject in any language, and for many years will doubtless be the standard treatise.

Macalister agrees with all modern historians that the Philistines were not Semites; and that Caphtor, the region from which they are said in the Old Testament to have come, is identical with the Egyptian Keftiu, or the Cretan empire. In the Old Testament they are also called *Krēthî*, or "Cretans". In three passages of the Old Testament they are called *Kārî*, or "Carians", which suggests that they came from Asia Minor rather than from the island of Crete proper. They are first mentioned in an inscription of Ramses III. (*c.* 1200 B. C.) as invading Palestine. Their migration is to be regarded as part of the shifting of races that occurred after the sack of Knossos and the downfall of the Minoan empire. With this agrees the archaeological fact that the Cretan art of the period "Late Minoan III." first appears in Palestine after 1200 B. C.

After this investigation of the origin of the Philistines, the author gives in chapter II. a sketch of their history based upon a full and critical study of the Biblical and other sources. In chapter III. he describes their land, with special emphasis upon the archaeological features of their cities as sites for possible excavation.

The fourth chapter is devoted to a discussion of the culture of the Philistines. The few words that are known to us permit no certain conclusions in regard to the affiliations of their language, except that it is not Semitic, and that it has connections with Asia Minor. The various scripts of Crete, when deciphered, may throw light upon this problem. Of peculiar importance is the Phaestos Disk. The most frequent character on this disk is the head with crested helmet. From the position in which this stands at the beginning of groups of signs it seems as if it must be a determinative before proper names. This crested helmet is identical with the helmet with which Philistines are depicted on the Egyptian monuments, and this suggests that the writers of the Phaestos Disk were near kinsmen of the Philistines. Out of some such alphabet as this with a limited number of signs, and not out of Egyptian or Babylonian, the so-called "Phoenician" alphabet must have been developed. This alphabet first appears in Palestine about 1000 B. C., and it is a plausible conjecture that it was introduced by the Philistines as one of the elements of their Aegean culture. Iron also was probably introduced into Palestine by this people (*cf.* I Sam. 13: 19–23). It is not found in any archaeological level below 1200 B. C. They also were responsible for the introduction of the late Minoan art into Palestine. Five shaft-graves found at Gezer show decided kinship with the shaft-graves at Knossos and Mycenae and are probably Philistine. The art remains that they contained were far in advance of the ordinary Canaanite or Hebrew remains. It is noteworthy also that the only temples that we read about in the Old Testament prior to the building of Solomon's temple are Philistine edifices. This seems to indicate that they were the pioneers in architecture as in the other arts in Palestine. These considerations show how unjustified is the modern use of the word "Philistine" to describe one who is destitute of higher culture.

LEWIS BAYLES PATON.

Roman Imperialism. By TENNEY FRANK, Professor of Latin, Bryn Mawr College. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1914. Pp. xiii, 365.)

MR. FRANK has been favorably known to students of Latin and Roman history for a number of years for his faithful work upon the diplomatic relations of the Roman Republic. A succession of interesting studies have appeared from his pen in *Classical Philology* and *Klio*. To the historian whose interest does not lead him to read the classical journals the author will be best known through his article upon "Mercantilism and Rome's Foreign Policy" which appeared in volume XVIII. of this review. His book upon *Roman Imperialism* will be heartily welcomed as the work of an able student, thoroughly acquainted with the ancient sources and the results of modern investigation upon the subject.

The period covered is that from the beginning of Rome's history to the death of Caesar, with a brief chapter in conclusion upon the imperialistic policy from Augustus to Trajan. In the first seven chapters, which carry us down to the war with Philip V. of Macedon, the new and dominant note of Mr. Frank's interpretation is the insistence upon the practical application in Roman foreign relations of the *jus fetiale*, which "did not recognize the right of aggression or a desire for more territory as just causes of war". At the time of the appearance of Mr. Frank's article upon the import of the fetial institution the reviewer regarded it as an interesting view which was not and could not be effectively supported because of the condition of our sources on the early history of the republic. In the framework of this connected presentation of Rome's expansion, Mr. Frank's theory of the *jus fetiale* as something more than a religious rite, something really vital and determinative, seems even less convincing, though he has tried hard to make it stand (pp. 8–10, 12, 47, 56, 65 *et al.*). His attempt to square the Roman occupation of Messina in 264 B. C. with the theory of the vital significance of the fetial rules (p. 89) cannot be regarded as convincing. The *results* of Rome's diplomacy during the period when it was guided, if we believe Mr. Frank, by this highly ethical principle, are certain. They are the conquest of the entire peninsula of Italy and the addition of Sicily, Sardinia, and Corsica.

Chapters VIII.–XIV. cover the period from 200 B. C. to 90 B. C. Throughout the second century Mr. Frank regards the policy of Rome as anti-imperialistic. He thinks it a great mistake to maintain that the older Scipionic policy was imperialistic (p. 186). In a later chapter (p. 250) he characterizes it as "mildly expansionistic". Cato, too, is anti-imperialistic. When the author says that the Gracchi were not aggressively imperialistic we shall all agree with him. It is not so easy to follow him when he rejects the long-accepted belief that Gaius Gracchus was playing for the support of the moneyed classes at Rome, especially the *equites*, when he arranged for the collection of the taxes of Asia through contracts let by the censors at Rome. The author's explanation of this action as due to Gracchus's passion for "efficiency" and a desire to increase the state revenues is poorly supported by the evidence he cites. Again it is to be noted that the actual result of this century of anti-imperialism was the acquisition of the province of Macedon, including Greece, and the provinces of Africa and Asia. The author's judgment must certainly be called into question when the divergence of policy and result is so great. Despite Mr. Frank's learning and cleverness in presentation it is quite inconceivable to the reviewer that the Roman expansion of the second century B. C. was the result of a policy of "meddling", with no definite principle behind it.

It is a distinct relief to read that the author finds real imperialists at last in the first century B. C. The first of these is Pompey. In chapter XIV. Mr. Frank presents the results of his study of Roman commercial-

ism in its relation to the foreign policies of the state. He is radically opposed to the accepted theory that the policy which broke the prosperity of Rhodes and caused the destruction of Corinth and Carthage in 146 B. C. was commercial. In his judgment Roman commerce does not appear as a determining factor in her foreign relations until the first century B. C. Interesting and cleverly organized as this chapter is, the reviewer regrets that he did not find it convincing. Throughout the book the attitude of the author is anti-Mommsen and the Roman senatorial policy receives a good whitewashing. It is unfortunate that Eumenes of Cardia, in Plutarch's *Eumenes*, has been confused with the Attalid king, Eumenes I. of Pergamum (p. 244). The ample notes appended to each chapter give evidence of vast reading. The index of the book is inadequate, as a reference to the subject of the fetial institution will demonstrate.

W. L. Westermann.

BOOKS OF MEDIEVAL AND MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

The Beneventan Script: a History of the South Italian Minuscule. By E. A. Loew, Ph.D., Research Associate of the Carnegie Institution of Washington. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1914. Pp. xix, 384.)

Among the so-called national hands into which the Latin handwritings of the early Middle Ages have been habitually divided in the palaeographical manuals, that termed Lombardic possesses the smallest measure of historical justification. Not only is the name misleading, since this form of writing had nothing to do with the Lombards or even with Lombardy, but, what is more important, the concept is erroneous, since it confuses in one family hands of quite different character from places as far apart as Monte Cassino and Corbie. All this and more was demonstrated by the brilliant investigations of Ludwig Traube, who showed that the unit in the literary history of this period was not the Roman province or the German kingdom but the monastic *scriptorium*, affected of course by regional influences but also by migration and by intercommunication of various sorts. As far as Italy is concerned, a well-defined book-hand arose only in the south, with Monte Cassino as the most active centre and the duchy of Benevento as its approximate territory, whence the medieval name *littera beneventana* which it is now recovering in place of the misnomer Lombardic. This script is the subject of the volume just published by Dr. Loew, an American pupil of Traube already known for his special work in this field, who has worthily carried on the master's tradition in the most thorough and comprehensive study that has yet been made of any of the handwritings of the early Middle Ages. As the result of a personal examination of more than six hundred extant manuscripts of Beneventan origin scattered in all parts of Europe, Dr. Loew has determined the extent and duration of

this form of writing, its rules and traditions, the forms of letters and combinations of letters, punctuation, and methods of abbreviation. How such matters may be of assistance in fixing the date and provenance of a manuscript and in the criticism of its text, those acquainted with Traube's studies will readily recognize. Dr. Loew has also an eye for matters of more general interest, for he realizes the importance of southern Italy in the history of medieval culture and is able to point out what we owe to the activity of Beneventan scribes. Thus Monte Cassino alone is responsible for the preservation to the modern world of Varro, Apuleius, the *Histories* of Tacitus, and a large part of the *Annals*; while extant manuscripts prove that the Greek physicians were known in the south before the time of Constantinus Africanus. The discovery of Beneventan *scriptoria* at Zara, Ragusa, and other points on the Dalmatian coast offers interesting proof that these outposts of Latin civilization derived their culture from Apulia and not from northern Italy. Dr. Loew's work is not only a credit to American scholarship but an excellent illustration of the value of endowing research in the humanities, for his years of patient labor were made possible by the assistance of the Carnegie Institution and Mr. James Loeb, and his results have become accessible to scholars through the liberality of the Clarendon Press, which also announces the publication of an accompanying collection of facsimiles under the title *Scriptura Beneventana*.

A defect of plan is the omission of charter hands, for whose exclusion no reason is given. One can well appreciate that any adequate treatment of the subject would have carried the author well beyond the limits of the present volume, but something should have been attempted, if only for purposes of comparison. The amount of dated and placed material in charters is far greater than in codices, and an examination of the originals at Naples, Cava, and Monte Cassino—to go no further afield—would at least have afforded a means of controlling the results gained from other sources. Such explorations might also possibly have made additions to the small number of cartularies mentioned in Dr. Loew's list of Beneventan manuscripts.

CHARLES H. HASKINS.

A Select Bibliography for the Study, Sources, and Literature of English Mediaeval Economic History. Compiled by a Seminar of the London School of Economics under the Supervision of HUBERT HALL, F.S.A., Reader in Palaeography and Economic History, University of London. (London: P. S. King and Son. 1914. Pp. xiii, 350.)

IT is a source of satisfaction to discover that there are in existence many more bibliographical guides than might be supposed. In the process of compiling the general bibliography of modern British history, the collaborators in that work have been struck with the number of scholarly

and adequate bibliographies of special fields of history that have been disclosed: a list of works concerning John and Sebastian Cabot, a list of works on English military history, a list of printed materials for the study of manorial history, for instance, and scores of similar publications, each giving reasonably full and clear information about sources or books on their respective subjects known or published up to their time. Of this character, though somewhat more general than most other books of its class, is the work recently compiled by Professor Hubert Hall's seminar in the London School of Economics.

An examination of its contents shows that the title of the work is construed broadly. Although it claims to be a bibliography merely of English history, it contains many descriptions of foreign archives and of publications on the history of Continental countries. Again, economic history is so interpreted as to comprise general works including material on economic history, as well as works specifically on economic subjects. Into economic history, moreover, are generously admitted the history of government, Parliament, the law courts, the Church, and military affairs. It is this inclusiveness that accounts for the more than 3000 titles to which the book extends, a much more extended bibliography than economic history, strictly interpreted, requires.

The most original and one of the most valuable characteristics of this work is the large portion of it devoted to that part of the subject described in the title as "the study of economic history". This section includes a very complete list of bibliographies of economic history and allied subjects, descriptions of state and local archives and their contents, both of England and Continental countries, and works on the sciences auxiliary to history. The main body of the work, more than two-thirds of it, is however devoted to lists of materials and works on history proper, divided, according to the usual modern practice, into sources and modern works. Even in the first of these sections information concerning records, surveys, official rolls, and such documents is especially full and valuable. All this evidently reflects and profits by Mr. Hall's special interests and knowledge. Much labor and research have evidently been put upon this work and a vast number of works of value and not familiar to English students are listed in it, while useful bibliographical information concerning more familiar works and collections of sources has in it been made easily accessible. The entries with but few exceptions are only of books published before 1910, an interval having elapsed between the completion of the collections and their publication.

This bibliography is on the whole the most valuable work in its field since the appearance of Gross's *Sources and Literature of English History*, and every student of English history must be grateful for its appearance. Moreover its value like that of Gross is enhanced by an unusually full and excellent index. One would be glad of a few words of criticism, analysis, or description of many works of which we are given only the name with the place and date of publication. There is

also in general a certain lack of discrimination that betokens the work of the collector of titles rather than the scholar. The reasons for this are clearly explained and justified in the preface. The collecting of titles was done by students, the classification and much of the description by Mr. Hall himself. We are far from suggesting that the book is padded, or that titles of works not of serious value are included; and certainly not a word could be spared from the description of the various national archives. At the same time it would certainly have been conducive to clearness and have made this work more valuable to students to have restricted it more rigorously to its announced field and not to have attempted to treat of history so widely.

EDWARD P. CHEYNEY.

English Industries of the Middle Ages: being an Introduction to the Industrial History of Medieval England. By L. F. SALZMANN, B.A., F.S.A. (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1913. Pp. xi, 260.)

THE above title will rouse hopes in the reader that at last we have a treatment of an important subject, more detailed than Ashley's, more synthetic than Cunningham's. In this hope he will be somewhat disappointed, for it has not been Mr. Salzmann's ambition to undertake such a task. He has rather availed himself of the opportune moment when the monographs of the *Victoria County History* have revealed new information regarding local industries to combine this with what was already accessible in printed records and in two or three good secondary books (*e. g.*, Lewis's *Stanneries*). But not alone in these fields has he garnered. A diligent worker in the Public Record Office, as his editions of various documents testify, he has been able to add gleanings of his own. They are most considerable in the chapters on metal working and on the mining of lead and silver, but they are easily discernible elsewhere.

To mention the subjects of these two chapters is to indicate Mr. Salzmann's method of treatment. For the most part he has confined himself to discussing the localization of certain industries and the technical processes employed in them. Any account of the marketing and sale of the commodities produced has been intentionally omitted. Such a procedure naturally has shortcomings. It does not result in what may be called a quantitative view of the subject. The relative importance of different manufactured products and the part which they played in domestic and foreign trade escape us. Nor are we told much about the interaction of industrial classes. The author does in a final chapter sketch the characteristics of the craft system. But many questions which are of considerable significance receive scant attention. Such, for instance, are the relation of the mercantile to the industrial crafts, especially in London, the extent to which craft regulations were dictated by

the desire to establish a monopoly, and, not least important, the differentiation of a group of permanent wage earners, the journeymen.

Mr. Salzmann's book is therefore by no means a comprehensive treatise on medieval English *industrial conditions*. It is, on the other hand, a very useful and scholarly discussion of the technique of some ten *industries*. Mining and quarrying, metal-working and pottery-making occupy the author most and constitute more than one-half of his chapters. The items relative to the appearance of cannon in England during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries are new and significant. The description of clothmaking is valuable, serving, as it does, to correct the misapprehension that the importance of the industry in England began only with the coming of Flemish weavers in the time of Edward III. Mr. Salzmann might have strengthened his contention by quoting the ordinance of Edward II. (*Cal. Pat. Rolls*, 1 Edward III., p. 99), a document which shows what the situation was before letters of protection had been issued to Flemings. The author does not explain for us in what relation the mysterious "bureller" stood to the draper; nor has he any doubt that Stamfords derived their name from the Lincolnshire borough rather than from *stamen forte*. One should, however, not be censorious of what Mr. Salzmann has omitted but grateful for a volume that contains much recondite knowledge, to which students of English industrial life will often gladly refer.

HOWARD GRAY.

Der Deutsche Staat des Mittelalters: ein Grundriss der Deutschen Verfassungsgeschichte. Von G. VON BELOW, Professor an der Universität Freiburg i. B. (Leipzig: Quelle und Meyer. 1914. Pp. xx, 387.)

THIS work, as the author says in the *Vorwort*, is the fruit of over a quarter of a century of the study and teaching of the constitutional history of medieval Germany.[1] In spite of the expressed purpose to stick strictly to the constitutional side of the subject—"Der Staat des Mittelalters als Staat; die mittelalterliche Verfassung als staatliche Verfassung"—fortunately for the student there is much more latitude of treatment than is implied in the title.

The book is at once a treatise on medieval German institutions and an historiographical survey. The first part, Literaturgeschichte des Problems, will be of keen enjoyment to one interested in historiography. It is divided into three chapters, the first dealing with the great interpreters of medieval German constitutional history from Haller (1768–1834) to Gierke. Between these parentheses, as it were, Eichhorn, Leo, Hegel, Dahlmann, Stahl, Duncker, Mohl, Bluntschli, and Waitz are

[1] In 1887–1888 Below published his well-known *Zur Entstehung der Deutschen Städteverfassung*, in which he brilliantly combated the *hofrechtliche* theory of town origins.

passed in review. In these thirty-eight pages the essential contribution of each is set forth with great clearness and conciseness. The inclusion of Haller, to whom eight pages are given, and Leo, who has six, possibly may not be as much a surprise to others as to myself. The waywardness of Haller's scholarship long ago made me indifferent to him. Born in Bern, he lived in Erlangen and in Vienna at the height of Napoleon's power (1801–1806); after the Restoration he went to Paris, where he published, first in French, his work on *La Restauration de la Science Politique* (Below cites the second, German edition of 1820), a work in which Haller pushed to an extreme his legitimist principles. He finally returned to Switzerland, abjured Protestantism, and died in the Catholic canton of Soleure. Leo's career was little less erratic. An enthusiastic member of the *Burschenschaft*, a participant in the Wartburg Festival, under the Holy Alliance Leo became a reactionary; then an ardent Hegelian, then a bitter adversary of it; then a rationalist, under the empire of which thinking he wrote his *Geschichte Italiens*; then a pietist again and reactionary polemist, during which period he wrote the *Skizzen*. Professor Below in spite of this eccentric history nevertheless finds Leo an important connecting link between Haller's theory of a patrimonial state and the Bismarckian policy.

The second chapter in part I. (pp. 38–101) deals with the monographic literature of the chief economic and social historians of Germany in the Middle Ages. Here Wilda, Hegel, Arnold, Nitzsch, Maurer, Sohm, Schmoller, Inama-Sternegg, Heusler, Lamprecht, and Gierke are passed in review. The scholar who wishes in a flash to learn the essential elements in the work of each of these—Wilda's theory of the heathen origin of gilds, Karl Hegel's refutation of the Roman theory of town origins, Nitzsch's *Grossgilde* theory of south German town beginnings, Gierke's compromise theory that the gild was in part a voluntary association, in part an authorized corporation, the variant determinations concerning the *Mark* and the *Hof* as germs of political formation—all these interpretations are succinctly set forth. Naturally Maurer's view that the urban community was a transformation out of the village group, its organization being a larger development of the latter, receives somewhat extended treatment, since Below himself is the leading advocate of this theory to-day. The discussion in this chapter is down to date, for Eberstadt, the newest supporter of the *hofrechtliche* theory, and Müller, the latest exponent of the idea that the gilds had no connection with earlier associations, and Keutgen, who has attempted to show the non-self-sufficiency of the manor and to discover an early germ in the *Aemter* and the law-merchant all receive notice.

In contrast with this long chapter the third is brief. It deals with purely legal historians—Brunner, Schroeder, Schulte, in particular.

Part II., Systematische Darstellung (pp. 112–369), may be described as a kind of manual of German feudal institutions with an historiograph-

ical running commentary. Phrases like "Haben wir es hier nur mit Theorien der Literatur zu tun" frequently recur. After a short prefatory chapter pointing out "Die wirtschaftlichen Voraussetzungen der deutschen Verfassung des Mittelalters" (pp. 112–128), the remainder of the volume is filled by a long, subdivided chapter on particular feudal institutions. Historically the termination point of this survey is about the year 1000, so that the book really requires a sequel which will continue the subject through the Franconian and Hohenstaufen periods.

Professor von Below is distinguished above most modern German writers by an intellectual litheness and a happy style. His *obiter dicta* are often of great suggestiveness and one in search for profitable subjects of investigation in medieval German history will often find the door to such half-opened to him. For example, on page 125, note, Below points out that the activity of free labor in medieval Germany outside of the towns is still a subject demanding examination.

JAMES WESTFALL THOMPSON.

Essai sur les Origines de la Chambre des Communes. Par D. PASQUET. (Paris: Armand Colin. 1914. Pp. 271.)

AN IMPORTANT service rendered by M. Pasquet's book is to bring together for comment, more completely than has been done before, the various suggestions as to the origin and earliest development of Parliament which have been made in the last fifteen years and the original evidence which bears upon the question. As to the origin of the representative system and the instances which occur before 1265, he does but little more than this. He adds the discussions of another student and these are of value, but the solution of the problem is not materially advanced. The outcome of his investigation is the traditional view, to which he contributes no more than a defense against all suggestions of modification, a defense intelligent and based on a good knowledge of details, but not always convincing. How much still remains to be done by minute investigation of this period may be seen by a comparison of Professor A. B. White's article in volume XIX. of this REVIEW, pages 735–750.

Doubt is raised at the outset as to the keenness of M. Pasquet's institutional insight by the statement on page 1 that the calling to Parliament of the new representatives to join the prelates and barons "is only the extension to new classes of society of the service of court which till then had been demanded by the king of his barons only", an idea wholly impossible to that age. Instead of an extension of the principle of court service, the new practice is evidence of its fatal decline. The great transformation which goes on so rapidly in the reign of Edward I. is no extension of the feudal idea whether in court service, or in military service, or in the aids, but a breaking down of feudal distinctions and properly to be called the end of political feudalism. All these changes

find their beginning in the reign of Henry III., a fact which M. Pasquet seems to have overlooked in the matter of military service.

The fundamental difficulty with M. Pasquet's book is that he does not perceive that for the institutional change which he is studying there are two distinct lines of preparation, the growth of the idea of representation, and the preparation of the institutions by means of which that idea was carried into operation. So long as the messenger who speaks *pro comitatu* carries a predetermined message, he is a deputy merely, and no step has been made towards the representative system, except in the preparation of institutions. When there begins to be evidence that the messenger is supposed to take part with others in the decision of a question not yet settled, without specific instructions and from considerations perhaps not known locally but presented in the assembly, there is evidence that idea and institution are beginning to unite and of the beginning of the representative system. This is what leads M. Pasquet to underrate the importance of the Parliament of 1264, in which he seems to think that I have found the complete representative system instead of the first evidence of its beginning a continuous development. This leads him also to underestimate the value of the suggestion made by Barker in his *Dominican Order and Convocation*, which is a contribution, not to the institutional preparation, but to that of ideas; and to overestimate greatly the importance of the case of 1254, which is on the institutional side solely. On this point see the article of Professor White referred to above.

M. Pasquet evidently supposes himself to disagree with the brief sketch of this evolution which I gave in the *Origin of the English Constitution* more seriously than I think he does. He certainly has made effective and correct use (pp. 28–32) of the suggestion which I there made of the institutional explanation of the action of 1254. His disagreements are in considerable part due to neglecting my qualifying words and, if to more care in this respect he would add a clear distinction between ideas and institutions, I should agree I think with nearly all that he says. Certainly no one could argue that the full representative system is to be found at first, or that the new elements exercised any great influence. It was only a beginning which was then made, but the beginning was made when idea and institution first combined, and not till then.

The best portion of the book is that which treats of the reign of Edward I., because that period has been less minutely examined heretofore. Besides a careful study of the cases, M. Pasquet's suggestions as to the motives of Edward in developing the system are of value. He finds three leading motives: 1. The importance of the knights in the assessment and collecting of the taxes and a wish to secure their co-operation by pledging them to the tax in advance. 2. To obtain the information about conditions throughout the country gained through the petitions presented from the local communities by their representatives. 3. To

bring all his subjects without distinction of feudal relationship under the king's direct authority and so to increase his resources. M. Pasquet tends to attribute a greater political insight to Edward I. than is possible, but these points seem substantially correct. Interesting is the suggestion of the development of early petitions, as seen in 1305, into the first form of legislation in which the House of Commons shares, and of the development of feudal aids into the taxes of the time, which I believe is quite correct, as indicated above (XIX. 344).

G. B. Adams.

The Wars of the Roses, 1377–1471. By R. B. Mowat, M.A. (London: Crosby Lockwood and Son. 1914. Pp. xii, 288.)

This work is a study and narrative of fifteenth-century English politics and their meaning and importance. The period covered is considerably broader than the title of the book would indicate and the delimiting dates 1377–1471, though hardly applicable to the Wars of the Roses, serve at least to indicate the scope of the monograph. The question of origins and background naturally comes first and this is dealt with in three short chapters, one of which describes the family settlement of Edward III., another discusses the constitutional history of the Lancastrian dynasty, and the third gives an account of the politics involved in the French war. Then follow sixteen chapters of purely narrative political character, covering in some detail the politics of the Lancastrian-Yorkist contest to 1471. The work concludes with three chapters of a general nature on the social and governmental conditions under Henry VI. and Edward IV., while a three-page epilogue tells of the accession of Henry VII. An index, a series of eight genealogical tables of royal and baronial houses, and a map to illustrate the Wars of the Roses complete the contents of the volume.

In view of the fact that detailed treatments of all or large part of the period covered by Mr. Mowat are already in print it is too much to expect to find much new material presented. Gairdner's introductions to the *Paston Letters* and Ramsay's two-volume work on *Lancaster and York* both contain more detailed narrative. It would almost seem as if Mr. Mowat could have omitted much of the rather tiresome political details or at least have condensed them considerably and organized his account more effectively. As he presents it here the story is too brief for the seeker after minute details and too full for one who is trying to get a perspective of the period. The value of Mr. Mowat's study, therefore, must depend largely on the interpretations which he gives, as his information is not new. His main thesis seems to be that the famous dictum of Stubbs—"Weak as is the fourteenth century, the fifteenth is weaker still, more futile, more bloody, more immoral", is not justified historically but that out of Lancastrian weakness and inefficiency came Yorkist strength and progressiveness, personified in Edward IV. "The

Wars of the Roses", says Mr. Mowat, "were a rough schooling to England, but they ushered in the glories of the Tudor reigns." The view that the fifteenth century saw the purging of England of many old-time political evils and that Edward IV. finally emerged as a king of the middle classes and so founded the new monarchy is not by any means new. Though still obsessed with ideas of Lancastrian constitutionalism, John Richard Green had the insight to write as follows in his *Short History of the English People*: "The old English Kingship, limited by the forces of feudalism, or by the progress of constitutional freedom, faded suddenly away, and in its place we see, all-absorbing and unrestrained, the despotism of the New Monarchy. . . . The founder of the New Monarchy was Edward IV." That the reign of Edward IV., rather than that of Henry VII., should form the dividing point in English history seems to be a sound contention and Mr. Mowat is to be commended for the general viewpoint expressed in the last and best of his chapters (ch. XXII.), entitled the Work of Edward IV.

In making his arguments and presenting his facts Mr. Mowat is usually clear and direct. There are numerous evidences, however, that in some of the finer and more critical aspects of historical scholarship and composition he is slightly at fault. His book is poorly organized and divided, the chapters being exceedingly varied in length and most of them ridiculously short. The nature of the contents would indicate a three-part organization of the subject-matter as logical and a consolidation into fewer chapters. The foot-notes throughout the work are merely volume and page references to authorities and have no great critical value, while the work as a whole lacks a bibliography or list of works consulted by the author. Even in handling the subject-matter of his special field Mr. Mowat is frequently incorrect or questionable in his viewpoints and statements. He over-emphasizes the Lollard leanings and affiliations of Richard II. and Anne of Bohemia (pp. 9–10); the suddenly gained power and prestige of Henry V. is surely exaggerated (p. 13); too much importance is attached to the failure of the Lancastrian kingship in France (p. 22); in one place (p. 70) Lord Bonvile is classed as a "great Lancastrian lord" while in another (p. 83) he is called "the Yorkist Lord Bonvile"; and there are numerous minor inaccuracies and examples of careless proof-reading throughout the volume. A remarkable example of a conglomeration of errors is seen in the sentence (p. 3), "By the extinction of the first line (1400, death of Richard *III.*), of the fifth line (death of the *young* Duke of Gloucester in *1309*), and by the union of the second and fourth lines in 1410, these royal houses were reduced to two." Other careless mistakes of chronology occur elsewhere and there is throughout a noticeable lack of critical and exact scholarship.

In spite of poor organization of material and errors of various sorts, students of English history will be inclined to welcome Mr. Mowat's study on account of its general correctness of viewpoint, its compara-

tive impartiality, and its convenient size, character, and make-up as a work of reference. The index is fairly adequate and the eight genealogical tables, though inadequately provided with life dates, are useful and interesting.

N. M. Trenholme.

The Reign of Henry the Fifth. By James Hamilton Wylie, M.A., D. Litt. Volume I., 1413–1415. (Cambridge: University Press. 1914. Pp. 589.)

This work is a continuation of the author's *History of England under Henry IV.*, which appeared in four volumes, 1884–1898, and it is similar in scope, idiosyncrasy, and charm, with a real advance in literary quality—and price (25 shillings). The criticism which accompanied the earlier work through its protracted production did not cause the author to curb his antiquarian, word-variant, and genealogical interests, or to reduce the saturation of his text with racy adaptations of contemporary aphorism and epithet. And the new volume is faithful to the tantalizing *genre* established by its predecessors.

To the many familiar with the author's *Henry IV.* it will be superfluous to state that *Henry V.* has little unity in the approved historical sense. The book is in truth a collection of discursive essays, tales, and discrete facts, bearing upon some of the dominant medieval interests, upon many of our modern interests in things medieval, and upon not a few hobbies of the author. The first chapter starts with the coronation of Henry V. and ends with the "epidemic of chin-cough called 'the thumps'", which, *e. g.*, kept the Registrar of the Parliament of Paris awake at night "with racking pains in his head, shoulders, legs, arms, ribs, kidneys, stomach and all over him" (p. 10). The Wylie touch is there! The last chapter (XXVII.) is devoted primarily to the conspiracy which immediately preceded the king's departure for France, and concludes with a five-page analysis of King Henry's will—which was superseded by the will made in 1421. Thus the *termini* of the book are marked off chronologically, but the road between is not fenced, and the author is able to wander into many series of branching by-paths, and to follow them, when he wishes, far behind and beyond the terminal points.

If the new book lacks historical unity, it possesses in a large degree the more primitive unity of life itself. Within the broad confines of his interests the author, attaching himself firmly to the very language of his sources, and with a manifest bias toward virile, racy, odorous, color-full phrases, brings the reader close to some features of Lollardy, superstition, treachery, diplomacy, building, monasteries, hospitals, arms, finance, wages, prices, food, dress, secularization—and hard commonsense of the time. These topics are handled "hither and yon"; one thing leads to another in apparently the most natural and artless fashion;

there is no attempt at systematic *Kulturgeschichte*; there is little generalization; and yet there is order within each chapter, and, best of all, the reader obtains a grasp upon the realities of the life of the times which is rare and precious.

The book, then, is another rich mine of miscellaneous lore upon and around the early fifteenth century, opened by the learned, hearty, and indefatigable author, and judging from the preface to the fourth volume of his *Henry IV.*, he would be well content to have it so regarded. The difference between the title of this work and its predecessor is another indication of his feelings on this point.

The foot-notes, which make up approximately half the book, demonstrate—despite the occasional use of ordinary secondary works for ancillary data—the remarkable breadth and depth of Wylie's scholarship. But the excessive compression of the citations, frequently reduced to the name of the author, or the abbreviated title, and the page, renders the work of identification a task, and the absence of a bibliography makes the defect serious. The numerous appendixes to which the reader is referred are missing. The index is fairly accurate, although it is not equal to that which so nobly completed the *Henry IV.* These blemishes would doubtless have been removed in the course of the publication of the entire work, which was apparently drawn on a much larger scale (one volume to two years) than *Henry IV.* (vol. I., 1399–1404), but the lamented death of the stout-hearted author, February 28, aged seventy, leaves us in doubt as to how much more we are to have. However, considering the interval between the last volume of *Henry IV.* and this volume, broken only by the *Council of Constance* (1900), it seems reasonable to cherish the hope that the author has left matter for at least another volume.

GEORGE C. SELLERY.

Studies in the History of English Commerce in the Tudor Period: The Organization and Early History of the Muscovy Company. By ARMAND J. GERSON, Ph.D. *English Trading Expeditions into Asia under the Authority of the Muscovy Company (1557–1581).* By EARNEST V. VAUGHN, Ph. D. *English Trade in the Baltic during the Reign of Elizabeth.* By NEVA RUTH DEARDORFF, Ph.D. [Publications of the University of Pennsylvania.] (New York: D. Appleton and Company. 1912. Pp. xi, 344.)

THERE is a much greater unity in this work of three graduates of the University of Pennsylvania than the title indicates. The reign of Elizabeth was a time of national quickening in England, and this characteristic is shown nowhere more clearly than in the adventuring of new kinds of foreign commerce in the face of physical and political obstacles. Almost everyone interested in the social life of the sixteenth century has a general acquaintance with the external side of the movement as

recorded in Hakluyt's collection of voyages; but the inner aspect has only recently begun to receive the attention it deserves. These three studies possess a double unity in the latter direction in so far as they describe the stream of commerce from England toward the Baltic and northeastern Europe and also since the chief commodities imported were requisites for the navy and shipping generally. To this the great adventure of the Russia Company in opening an overland route to Persia constitutes a fascinating appendix.

The studies of Dr. Gerson and Dr. Vaughn have been restricted by the want of documents. Both have made a conscientious study of the chief manuscript sources available, and have examined almost all these. That they have not been fortunate in discovering all that might have been found is to a large extent accidental. For instance, certain law papers give much information concerning the results of the Russian and Persian trades as well as the way in which the company managed its affairs. Dr. Gerson blames the great fire of 1666 for the destruction of documents; and, though some papers perished then, the company itself considered another fire in 1838 as having made greater havoc amongst its records. Fortunately the minute-books after 1666 escaped the second catastrophe and a book is at present in preparation which will give extracts from them.

Both the studies relating to the Russia Company are competent and clear. Each is already so concise that I could not do justice to the authors by a brief summary. The narratives can be recommended most cordially to the growing number of students who are anxious to study the elusive springs of the early flow of sea-borne commerce. A few details may be mentioned where various statements require qualification. Though a "dual governorship" was rare it was not peculiar to this company (p. 26). Other instances occur in the Society of Mines Royal, in that of the Mineral and Battery Works, and in the Company of Kathai. The mode of election of members suggested (p. 36) is inconsistent with the joint-stock character of the company. There appear to have been commercial causes (as well as the political ones mentioned on p. 82) for the abrogation of the monopoly in Russia. The alleged poverty of the company (pp. 88, 89) can easily be exaggerated—as a matter of fact it sometimes paid very high dividends. The difficulties of the overland route through Russia to Persia can scarcely be described as "insuperable" (p. 196). If the English had not been able to tap the markets of the Orient *via* the Levant and the Cape of Good Hope, they might, in time, have succeeded by the Caspian.

Dr. Neva R. Deardorff's account of the Eastland Company during the same period is largely new and is of very great interest. Examination of the Polish State Papers at the Public Record Office in London as well as a number of manuscripts at the British Museum has given material for the reconstruction of the life of a typical regulated company. The effects of an intricate political situation on the trade are

explained with clearness. No doubt the central fact is the rise of the Eastland Company on the ruins of the Steelyard—still it is a mistake to date the commencement of the company in the reign of Elizabeth. The charter of 1408 (Rymer, *Foedera*, VIII. 511), in giving the Eastland merchants the privilege of choosing governors and other rights, points to some kind of corporate life. Earlier than that—about the middle of the fourteenth century—there are indications of some kind of organization in the trade. Why this trade declined (as it seems to have done) by the middle of the sixteenth century is a problem: the reason of its advance toward the end of the reign of Elizabeth is to be found in the growing importance of the materials for the building and repair of ships. The dependence of England on imported powder (p. 229) is overstated. The country had a considerable home supply, but it could not be increased rapidly in an emergency. The conversion of Elizabethan currency into modern values (sterling) at a ratio of 1:5 is not very satisfactory. One would wish rather more detailed references than the symbols "A. P. C. X." or "A and O". Those who know the authorities will recognize what is intended, others are more likely to be puzzled than edified.

W. R. Scott.

The Colonising Activities of the English Puritans: the last Phase of the Elizabethan Struggle with Spain. By Arthur Percival Newton, Lecturer in Colonial History, University of London. With an Introduction by Charles M. Andrews. [Yale Historical Publications, Miscellany, I.] (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1914. Pp. x, 344.)

The records of the Providence Company have hitherto been neglected by American historians, and many students will join Professor Andrews in welcoming this volume as filling in missing parts of our colonial history. Its scope is less broad than its title, since it devotes far more space to the colonies of adventure in the Caribbean Sea than to the contemporary foundation of the commonwealths of New England. Mr. Newton succeeds in linking these enterprises with the exploits of the Elizabethan interlopers and with the invaders of Jamaica—and he might have added, with the later buccaneers. The consolidation of the Puritan party under Pym's leadership during the twelve years of the personal government of Charles I. is also shown to be a result of the association of a score of notables in the Providence Company, of which Pym was the actual manager, though the Earl of Holland was its nominal governor. The Earl of Warwick, Holland's elder brother, may be regarded as the founder of the company, by which he hoped to renew the speculations which had been baffled by the opposing faction in the Virginia and Bermuda companies after 1620. Providence was garrisoned in 1630 in order, as we are told by Sir William Monson, the

last of the Elizabethan admirals, "to nourish and uphold piracies". Though the introduction finds "the unity of Puritan activity in England and New England and the Caribbean" in these pages, the author admits that "the founding of an ideal community and the pursuit of a profitable investment are incompatible aims"; and he cites many pages of Winthrop's journal in which this incompatibility is manifested.

The islands of Old Providence and St. Andrews, which agents of the United States proposed to purchase from Colombia in 1913, were named in the patent to the adventurers in 1630, and the bounds were soon enlarged to include Association, the Tortuga of the buccaneers. These islands remained under the absolute rule of the company in London until they were recaptured by the Spaniard in 1641. The commonwealth of Massachusetts selected magistrates among actual settlers; and the hereditary principle was rejected in vigorous terms when it was proposed in 1636 to introduce an order of "gentlemen of the country", with a reservation of the higher offices for them and their heirs—a proposal which Mr. Newton thinks the colonists should have accepted as a reasonable interpretation of the English constitution. The offer made by two of the "Lords of Providence", Saye and Sele and Brooke, who wished to bring over "other persons of quality", resembles the "new plan to govern Virginia" presented to the king in 1623—perhaps by some ally of Warwick's—as a means to "suppress popular liberty". As an inducement to divert his voyage from New England to Providence in 1638, the company assured a notable minister that men of quality would be preferred in the council and magistracy in the island. To Winthrop, at least, the proposal to found a petty aristocracy under an absolute proprietor was objectionable. By 1640 the governor learned that the "Lords of Providence" were resolved to mobilize the population of New England—Pym counted on drawing men from Virginia also—for the invasion of the Spanish dominions in buccaneering fashion. Winthrop met Saye's plea for this migration, which was coupled with an argument for aristocracy, with due asperity; but Pym's speech in the Short Parliament, with its impatient plea for this transfer and its declaration that the king's reluctance to support privateering in the West Indies was one of the notable grievances of his subjects, had to remain unanswered; and it seems to have converted many divines of the Westminster Assembly into partizans of the enterprise in the Caribbean. Not many colonists were diverted to Providence; but Massachusetts furnished a governor to succeed Nathaniel Butler, one of Warwick's agents in dealing with pirates at Bermuda about 1620. John Humphry, a restless adventurer because of his aristocratic alliances, had long had an eye on Warwick's projects; and in 1630 he had urged the "choice people" of New England to please "our noble friends" by seeking adventures in other regions, leaving the worthless "mixt multitude" behind as tenants of the lands. Absenteeism had not answered in his case, and he was glad to accept a predatory appointment in 1641, though he could not sail in time to reach the island before it was taken by the Spaniards.

In spite of the complaints of the company recited in Pym's speech, Charles I. could hardly have gone further in aiding the West Indian project—unless he had been ready to employ the ship-money fleets in a Spanish war. The courtly Earl of Holland had found it easy to secure royal patents: the original boundaries were enlarged to cover Tortuga—but the Bahamas lay outside the project, as Mr. Newton has to insist in the face of current blunders; a forgotten patent of 1635 for traffic on the Main is here noted for the first time; and it is shown that the king licensed the company to make reprisal for the attack on Providence and the expulsion of the English from Tortuga. Early in 1636 ships were commissioned to take prizes from Spaniards "beyond the Canaries to the southward"—terms which warrant "No peace beyond the Line", and show where the Line was, which Mr. Newton does not explain. He has also missed the most remarkable patent for buccaneering ever issued by an English sovereign. Following the terms of Richelieu's charter for his West India Company in 1634, Charles I. licensed Warwick and his associates in 1638 to seize ships, sack towns, and conquer territory wherever "the free navigation, trade, or commerce of any of our subjects is or shall be denied".

The company had reported that their island could be made profitable only by war or reprisal; and privateering, of which a monopoly was claimed under the patents, was the main feature of the enterprise until Providence was retaken in 1641. Warwick continued to send roving squadrons to the West Indies for several years after that event. As admiral of England and governor-in-chief of the American plantations for the Long Parliament he could disregard the king's revocation of his patent and the remonstrances of the Spanish ambassador. Perhaps he was less of a pirate then than he had been when his ships disturbed traffic in the East and West Indies under a commission from Savoy. Mr. Newton deals gently with the Virginian phase of Warwick's career; he shows that the earl was no mere tool of the court; but he does not like to call him a pirate. The employment of Butler and Elfrith in Providence in spite of their piratical reputation, has to be noted in any discussion of the strife in the Virginia Company.

Access to original papers has given Mr. Newton advantages unattainable in America, and he has cleared up many dark corners. He has missed some printed material however; and he tells less than might be desired about Warwick's colonies at Trinidad and Ruatan, both more interesting than Saybrook, and quite as pertinent to his title. Nor does he allude to the repeated attempts of the Jamaican buccaneers to reclaim Providence under the patent granted to the company. Mr. Newton has few minor errors, and is diligent in economic detail; but some of us would like to be told more about the rovings of Captain William Jackson up to 1645, and where he got the bells which used to hang in the steeples of Boston.

C. G. Calkins.

The History of England from the Accession of James the Second. By Lord MACAULAY. Edited by CHARLES HARDING FIRTH, M.A., Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Oxford. Volume II. (London: Macmillan and Company. 1914. Pp. xx, 517–1039.)

THE second volume of the illustrated edition of Lord Macaulay's *History of England* covers the period which began with Monmouth's expedition and ends with the acquittal of the seven bishops, which is to say chapters V. to VIII. inclusive. With this we come full into the stream of the story and can well determine the character and quality of the work the editor and publisher have set themselves to do. As might be expected the illustrations continue to develop largely on the side of portraiture, though the maps and plans, and the facsimiles of contemporary prints, broadsides, and documents are by no means wanting. In effect, however, this is a portrait gallery. It may not be true, as his critics averred, that Macaulay brought into his history every Non-conformist minister who could have any pretension to be remembered and many who had no such claim whatever; it may be true that he described many individuals as well as many circumstances in which no one would or ought to have the slightest interest to-day; yet nothing which has ever been written about Macaulay produces the effect of these illustrations in demonstrating his marvellously intimate acquaintance with the almost innumerable individuals whose actions and characters he chronicles. Here, for the first time, we see the Revolution literally face to face. As to the choice of portraits, when so much is included there is little to be said. The plates in color, Lely's Monmouth, Kneller's James II. and his Shrewsbury, Wissing's Mary of Modena, van Dyck's Children of Charles I., van Ceulen's curious picture of William III. as a child, the extraordinary Harding-Maratti's Sunderland as a Roman, and Maubert's Dryden, with one or two exceptions only make us wish for more. In particular it seems a pity that thus far we have had no color portrait of the Duchess of Marlborough, who, if anyone in the period deserves that honor, certainly seems entitled to a place, as well by her beauty as by her prominence. It is to be hoped that such an opportunity may not be overlooked.

With regard to the plan of the edition it appears that only Macaulay's own words are to be here reproduced. While there are advantages from the standpoint of the scholar, who will probably try—or be able—to purchase only the final volume of notes, and from that of the mere reader who may not care to be bothered with notes at all, there is a certain feeling of disappointment that, in this volume particularly, with its highly controverted points, the Penn case, the Stuart case, and others of less consequence, there is not even a hint that Macaulay's is not the final word. To some, moreover, the device of numbering pages consecutively, so that volume II. begins with page 517 and ends with page

1039, evidently seems to be the only proper device for a definitive edition of a classic whose words are thus forever fixed, embalmed, and sacred to a particular place within the whole. To others it may appear an almost excessive stretch of the definitive spirit, whose advantages are overbalanced by its inconveniences. But, whatever the criticisms, one fact remains, this is an edition not merely worthy of the text but one which is likely to be henceforth regarded as the "standard" Macaulay.

W. C. Abbott.

The Life of Charles Third Earl of Stanhope. Commenced by Ghita Stanhope, revised and completed by G. P. Gooch. (London, New York, Bombay, and Calcutta: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1914. Pp. vi, 286.)

Mr. Gooch, at the request of the Hon. and Mrs. Henry Stanhope, presents in this volume the completed biography of the third Earl Stanhope which was begun by their daughter and the earl's great-great-granddaughter, the late Ghita Stanhope, and left unfinished at her death. It is unlikely that this book fairly represents the abilities of either of the collaborating authors, and it is difficult under the circumstances to ascribe praise or blame. The first six chapters, which bring Stanhope to the French Revolution and to his break with his brother-in-law, Pitt, were practically complete at the death of the projector of the work. These chapters are much like the numerous biographies that were published in the mid-Victorian period for the primary purpose of exploiting family papers or paying tribute to the memory of a distinguished relative of the author. In this case the latter purpose predominates, and the family papers have yielded few documents that will be of material use to the students of the history of the time. The tenth chapter, entitled Steamboats and Canals, which is likewise largely the work of Miss Stanhope, "embodies", Mr. Gooch tells us, "the results of prolonged research, and forms a valuable contribution to the history of naval construction and administration". Even this chapter contains no novel points of importance and merely serves to illustrate the exaggerated conservatism which in that period characterized the management of British naval affairs and of the British government in general.

The remaining chapters of the book are from the pen of Mr. Gooch, who is more familiar with the general history of Stanhope's time, and therefore writes with a surer touch than did his collaborator. He traces the career of the eccentric nobleman as a sympathizer with the principles of the French Revolution, an opponent of the war with France, and a consistent supporter of liberal views of religion and politics in England, concluding with a notice of his activities as an inventor and some references to his unfortunate domestic experiences. A majority of the numerous letters which Mr. Gooch quotes at length were already accessible

in print, and few of those he has gleaned from the manuscripts at Chevening and Holland House will be of much service to students of history.

Both of the authors are careless and inconsistent in their citations to authorities. References appear, for example, to "Pitt Papers" (pp. 234, 235), "Chatham Papers" (pp. 21, 38, 232), and "Chatham Correspondence" (p. 23), with no indication of page or bundle. We are referred to "Stanhope Papers", "Chevening Papers", and "Chevening MSS.", with nothing to indicate whether they are one and the same. There is one citation to "Rutland MSS.", with nothing to indicate the volume, page, or manner of publication of that collection of papers (the letter cited is in the printed calendar). There are instances also of carelessness or errors both in the use of language and the statement of fact. For example, Pitt did not "emphatically decline" (p. 53) to be associated with Shelburne in attacking North's party in the early months of 1783, and the use of the single word "Chancellor" to indicate the Chancellor of the Exchequer is questionable to say the least.

WILLIAM THOMAS LAPRADE.

Le Congrès de Rastatt, 11 Juin 1798–28 Avril 1799. Correspondance et Documents publiés pour la Société d'Histoire Contemporaine par MM. P. MONTARLOT et L. PINGAUD. Tome III. (Paris: Alphonse Picard et Fils. 1913. Pp. 419.)

WITH thirty-seven Debry and thirty-two Roberjot letters, dating from the outbreak of war with Austria to the assassinations (April 28, 1799), this volume completes a total of three hundred such items, covering the 322 days of residence of Debry and Roberjot at the congress (vols. I. and II., reviewed XVIII. 398, 624). The ninety-eight letters from Roberjot to Talleyrand reveal a faithful, modest diplomat who was the working member of the commission (see III. 150), and are the main contribution of these volumes. The 178 Debry letters constantly disclose the politician in the diplomat's guise, with his wearisome drivel about serving his country; with his know-it-all budgets of gossip diplomatic, punctuated with observations drawn from his crude, sleek self-assurance; and with his growing solicitude for his political future and even his personal safety (III. 147–149). The correspondence in this volume covers a period of waiting that was possibly as malign as watchful, as the letters do not quite conceal; and the commissioners themselves must share with the Directory the responsibility for such unprotected pursuit of dangerous business on the edge of the war zone through more than two months. It is small wonder that, when the Austrians arrived with orders to expel them, the matter came to a bloody issue.

With regard to the crime, this volume contains seventy-seven items, mostly Debry papers, newly published but trivial in value. The really important items are a few translations of documents published in the

well-known German works of Vivenot, Hüffer, Obser, and Criste, due care being taken to select those which shall contribute to "cette longue justification de Jean Debry", as the editors naïvely describe their work (III. 380). These are only a few of the eighty-two similar items calendared in Freiherr von Helfert's *Zur Lösung der Rastatter Gesandtenmord-Frage* (Stuttgart, 1900, pp. 110–116), one of the German works not cited by the editors. Granted the apparent guilt of the Szekler hussars (the Magyar Rough Riders), which was substantially conceded by Thugut and the Archduke Charles (III. 202–212), and the apparent location of responsibility for the military orders in question which is indicated by the archduke, the accusations against the French émigrés, the Directors, and Debry still remain to be disproved, not merely denied. Görger, the brigade commander of the Szeklers, who is in the archduke's list of the culpable, was an émigré, other émigrés were in the fatal neighborhood, and other reasons for suspicion were not lacking. The later despatches between the Directors and their commissioners at Rastatt have a tone that is perhaps peculiar, perhaps unpleasant. This "something queer" is still more noticeable in the treatment of Debry and of the whole affair by the Directors, including Debry's own intimate correspondents, Merlin and Treilhard; and after the *coup d'état* of 30 Prairial, the new Directors, controlled by Sieyès, another intimate correspondent of Debry, treat the affair with cold neglect. Still more pointed was the refusal of Bonaparte to unravel the mystery and his promptitude in closing Debry's mouth, for directly after the treaty of Lunéville, which Debry denounced because it required no reparation for the crime, the troublesome survivor was banished from the tribunate to the harmless silence of the prefecture of the Doubs. The editors have sought by the publication of these papers to do justice to the memory of their hero; it might have been kinder to have burned the papers and allow their hero to be forgotten, than to have revealed him as a hero of melodrama; and, withal, they have not disproved the suspicions which curiously attach to Debry, whose efforts, first to profit politically as the hero of wounds, variously numbered from thirteen to forty, too obviously more damaging to his clothes than to his person, and later to clear himself from suspicion of complicity, border on the ludicrous until they become merely senile.

The net result is three more volumes, with an index, on the Rastatt Congress, and no diminution in the density of the haze about the question. The very suspicions that the volumes seek to allay receive new life, when probable French innocence can array so little proof for its defense. The proof of Austrian guilt still falls just short of being conclusive, because of that possibility of French intrigue.

GEORGE MATTHEW DUTCHER.

The Confederation of Europe: a Study of the European Alliance, 1813–1823, as an Experiment in the International Organization of Peace. By WALTER ALISON PHILLIPS, M.A. (London and New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1914. Pp. xv, 315.)

IN this volume is printed a series of lectures which Mr. Phillips delivered at Oxford University in 1913. The author states in the preface that his purpose was not purely historical; for he wished to illustrate the problems involved in the application of the principles of international law in connection with the movement for the organization of peace.

In Rousseau's critique of Abbé St. Pierre's project for perpetual peace with which Prince Alexander of Russia was made acquainted by his favorite tutor, Frédéric César de La Harpe, Mr. Phillips finds the inspiration of the project for international peace which was proclaimed by Alexander after he became czar. He finds a link in the evolution of Alexander's plan for a universal peace union in the instructions addressed on September 11, 1804, by Prince Czartoryski to Novosiltsov, who was sent by the czar as special envoy to London. The author analyzes the treaty of Chaumont, which he considers the foundation of the confederation of Europe, and the first treaty of Paris, a move in the direction of a wider European concert. He declares that the policy of England at the Congress of Vienna was "to group" Russia with other powers and thus to render the czar harmless—an object which was accomplished in the second treaty of Paris. Mr. Phillips attaches less importance than some other students of this period to the influence which the religious fanatic, Baroness von Krüdener, exerted upon Alexander just before he proclaimed the Holy Alliance. He considers the treaty of alliance of November 10, 1815, between Russia, Prussia, Austria, and England as furnishing a new basis for the confederation of Europe. The persistence with which Czar Alexander clung to his plan for an international peace union, the schemes of Metternich to use the quadruple alliance for his own purposes, and the widening of the rift within the alliance at Troppau and at Laibach are successively discussed.

Mr. Phillips emphasizes the opposition of Castlereagh to the policies of Alexander and of Metternich, while he presents in detail the view that Canning "merely took up and developed the policy of Castlereagh". Perhaps the most enlightening parts of the book are the chapters which describe the interesting debates of the Allies at Aix-la-Chapelle and Verona in regard to Spain and the Indies. The sentences which describe the revolt in the Spanish Indies are inaccurate. In discussing the genesis of the Monroe Doctrine Mr. Phillips suggests that Nesselrode's letters to Tuyll in 1823 really expressed the desire of the czar to include the United States in the Holy Alliance. In conclusion the author declares that the problems involved in the recent peace movement are fundamentally the same as the problems which arose in the history of

the confederation of Europe: namely, those arising from an attempt to protect artificial boundaries. In regard to the bibliography of his subject, Mr. Phillips does not use many authorities that are not mentioned in the bibliographical list in the *Cambridge Modern History* to which the reader is referred.

Singular though it may seem, Mr. Phillips has at times failed to distinguish between the quadruple alliance and the Holy Alliance. As the author indicates in the preface, his views in regard to several important topics had already been suggested in an article on "The Peace Movement and the Holy Alliance" in the *Edinburgh Review* (CCXV. 405–433) and in his chapter on "The Congresses, 1815–1822", in the *Cambridge Modern History* (X. 1–39). But these topics are now discussed in considerable detail; while the text is supported by many references to manuscript material in the Public Record Office. In presenting a detailed and documented study of England's attitude towards the so-called confederation of Europe, Mr. Phillips has performed a real service for students of diplomatic history. But as the diplomatic material dealing with the Allies, which reposes in several archives of the Continent, has not been exploited, the views of Mr. Phillips in regard to the policy of the Continental powers towards the so-called confederation of Europe are not definitive. This volume would have been more useful to students of history if the author had described more fully and clearly the rôle of the Holy Alliance.

W. S. Robertson.

Camillo di Cavour e Mélanie Waldor, secondo Lettere e Documenti inediti. Per Francesco Ruffini. (Turin: Bocca. 1914. Pp. iii, 178.)

The love affairs of Italy's greatest statesmen and patriots cannot be said to have exercised a determining influence upon any of the notable events of the Risorgimento, but they well repay historical investigation for the light which they throw upon the character of the Italian leaders, and because in their love correspondence these men made political declarations and revelations of peculiar frankness, which add materially to our knowledge of public events. The craving for liberty was an absorbing passion but it was easily fused with the passion of love in the glowing days of Risorgimento struggle when women of all classes vied with the men in sacrifices which they were ready to make in the cause of national independence. If the love affairs of Victor Emmanuel, Cavour, Mazzini, and Garibaldi were excluded from the history of modern Italy, evidence of primary importance upon political events would be irreparably lost.

Michelangelo Castelli in his *Il Conte di Cavour* declared that "no woman exercised upon Cavour the least political influence". The latter did, however, himself frequently seek to influence other statesmen *through* women. And *to* the women whom he himself trusted he con-

fided many of his own political aims and secrets. Among these latter Mélanie Villenave Waldor, the French novelist, thanks to Francesco Ruffini's minute researches, now takes a prominent and curious historical place in the period of Cavour's earlier life. For his biographers perhaps the most important of all his letters was that addressed to her in May, 1838, when she sought to persuade him to abandon Piedmont and seek a career in Paris; it contains the patriotic passage: "No, no, it is not by fleeing from one's country because it is unfortunate that one may attain glory. . . . Fortunate or unfortunate my country shall have all my life; I shall never be unfaithful to it, even if I were sure to find elsewhere a brilliant destiny" (pp. 65–66). This letter was already known, but Ruffini has fixed its correct date, placing it three years later in Cavour's life than Chiala had done. Through a second letter, left unpublished by Chiala, Ruffini has been able to discover the fact that Cavour was the protagonist of the Waldor's novel published in 1839, *Alphonse et Juliette*, and has traced several biographical details in the romance. In this letter, dated September 10, 1839, Cavour forecasts the war of 1859: "I conceive the delights of war, when a noble motive inspires one and a glorious purpose is revealed" (p. 146). Again Ruffini finds that a later letter, of April 26, 1849, which has previously been falsely described as addressed to Countess de Circourt, was in reality addressed to the Waldor; it is a letter in which he forecasts the Franco-Italian alliance: "The fate of Italy depends upon that of France" (p. 159). Ruffini suggests that when Italian archives have been unreservedly opened to the historian, it may be discovered that later Cavour, when prime-minister, utilized the influence of the Waldor with the Napoleonic government to further the interests of Italy.

Until now the relations between Cavour and the Waldor have remained completely unknown, save for the letter of 1838. On Cavour's side they were quasi-Platonic. Ruffini's ingenuity in tracing them on the barest evidence would do honor to a Sherlock Holmes, while the care with which he accumulates evidence in support of his statements bespeaks historical method of the highest order. Ruffini's publications place him among the first historians of the Risorgimento.

Cavour's archives at Santena have been freely worked in the preparation of the present volume, and Ruffini has brought out fresh evidence upon another love affair of Cavour. The reason for his having remained a bachelor at this period comes out in another Waldor letter unknown to Chiala: "There is still at the bottom of my heart an image which is an unsurmountable obstacle to marriage" (p. 131). This obstacle was love for a married woman, not the famed "Incognita" but a newly discovered blonde "Innominata".

While the primary interest of the volume for the historian is psychological, the letters throw not a little light upon contemporary customs and conditions in Piedmont. It has been published as volume VIII. in Bocca's *Biblioteca di Storia Contemporanea*.

H. Nelson Gay.

Epistolario di Luigi Carlo Farini. Per cura di LUIGI RAVA. Con Lettere inedite di Uomini illustri al Farini e Documenti. (Bologna: Nicolà Zanichelli. 1911–1914. Pp. lxii, 837; xlviii, 799; cxv, 621.)

La Giovinezza di un Dittatore, Luigi Carlo Farini, Medico. Per LUIGI MESSEDAGLIA. Con Introduzione di LUIGI RAVA. [Biblioteca Storica del Risorgimento Italiano, Serie VII., N. 12.] (Milan, Rome, Naples: Albrigi, Segati, e Compagnia. 1914. Pp. lxii, 553.)

AFTER Chiala's well-known publication of Cavour's *Lettere edite ed inedite,* and Menghini's scholarly and exhaustive national edition of Mazzini's *Scritti editi ed inediti,* this *Epistolario* of Luigi Carlo Farini must be ranked as the most important publication that has been undertaken upon the history of Italy's Risorgimento from 1815 to 1870. The eleven volumes of Baron Ricasoli's *Lettere e Documenti* also constitute a source of first-rate importance, but Ricasoli's work was primarily of local Tuscan interest down to 1859, while his achievements of that year and of his later public life were, generally speaking, already largely understood from public documents outside his own archives. Farini's virile activity and devoted personal sacrifice for the national weal cover a wider field and were of no less vital import. After the "Big Four" who made modern Italy (Cavour, Victor Emmanuel II., Mazzini, and Garibaldi), Farini may well take his place in the national biography as Italy's first public citizen in point of ability, while his actual services as a statesman, in the accomplishment of national independence and unity, rank with those of Massimo d'Azeglio and Ricasoli. A national edition of d'Azeglio's correspondence and works should follow as the next important addition to the *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores* of the Risorgimento.

It is fortunate that Farini's important private archives have fallen into the hands of such a competent scholar as Luigi Rava, himself a statesman of distinction. It was the testamentary wish of Farini's son, Domenico Farini, president of the Italian Senate, that Farini's papers should be published, out of justice to his memory, and after the death of Domenico Farini in 1900, the family entrusted them to Rava. But as politics had robbed Italy of a great physician in Luigi Carlo Farini, so to-day politics have done their best to rob Farini of his editor and biographer. Since he undertook the publication of the *Epistolario* Rava has twice been called to hold portfolios in Italian ministries, those of Commerce and Public Instruction successively, and to-day he has entered the recently formed Salandra ministry with the portfolio of Finance.

This extenuating circumstance of the preoccupations of high public office disarms the critic of the *Epistolario* who would complain to the editor of the almost total absence of explanatory notes that characterizes the three volumes thus far published; complete notes would have

added immeasurably to the value of the work. It must have been no small sacrifice for a student such as Rava, possessed of sound historical method, to publish the correspondence in this nude fashion; many of the letters are of absolutely no interest without a detailed knowledge of the circumstances and conditions under which they were written. But it certainly has been much better to give the correspondence to the light as it is, than it would have been to delay publication further. The volumes contain a mass of new material that is indispensable to the just appreciation of many events of the Risorgimento period; the competent student can supply his own commentary, and furthermore Rava has solemnly promised to publish eventually a volume of biography and notes. As Italian ministries are not eternal, the historian has reason to expect that Rava will in good time be able to fulfill his pledge. The important introductions which he has prefixed to the first and third volumes, and which, with some alterations, had been previously published in the *Nuova Antologia* of April 1, 1911, and November 16, 1913, exhibit keen critical ability and a wide historical knowledge. Together they give an excellent biographical sketch of Farini down to 1851. No good life of Farini has been heretofore published, and such as there were, have been proved to be rich in misstatements, by the present *Epistolario*.

Rava has happily printed Farini's letters without omissions, and has supplemented them by a great number of letters of correspondents addressed to him, and also by a few letters, not by Farini, addressed to others; in the third volume the letters of Farini's correspondents considerably surpass in number those written by him. This suggests that many other of his letters may yet come to light. Three letters of Cesare Balbo to Farini are given, but none from Farini to Balbo excepting the published dedication of his *Lo Stato Romano*. But Balbo's archives are known to have been preserved and at least a few good Farini letters addressed to Balbo exist. Farini's letters to Marco Minghetti as given in the *Epistolario* had all been previously published in the latter's *Ricordi*, excepting two relatively unimportant letters regarding a certain Maggi. But Minghetti's papers, which have been deposited by his widow in the Archiginnasio of Bologna, will be unsealed in about ten years, and important unpublished letters of Farini may then be expected, particularly of the period subsequent to 1859, the year with which Minghetti's *Ricordi* end.

The arrangement of the letters is chronological, and the volumes are furnished with excellent indexes of the persons to whom and by whom they are addressed. Several of the letters, particularly in the second volume, are without date, but when Rava prepares his notes he will certainly be able to supply dates to some of these from internal evidence. The letter without date numbered 47 (f) was written on April 11, 1848, as is shown by mention of the "Demonstration against the Treasurer", which took place on that morning. Letter numbered 204 is of September 13, 1848.

Of the letters addressed to Farini a number are from d'Azeglio, unpublished and of particular importance; there are also many notes from Minghetti written when he was Minister of the Interior of Pius IX. in 1848, and when Farini was under-secretary. These and the unpublished letters of many other correspondents and of Farini himself in the period, reveal the state of mind from day to day of the government of Pius IX. during the revolution, and also of the high functionaries in different parts of the Pontifical States; as an historical source this collection of documents is much more important than Farini's four volumes, *Lo Stato Romano,* published 1850–1853, with a political purpose.

The evolution of Farini's own political creed is one of the most interesting revelations of the new documents. On March 28, 1848, Farini wrote (II. 147–148): "I do not understand how brains can conceive the dream of concentrating the government of Italy in the hands of one single prince! I do not know, I do not understand it, even if one looks to a distant future. Now, it is more than a dream, it is delirium, it is madness, it is more than madness, it is moral and political infamy. . . . The unity of Italy . . . consists and must consist in unity of laws, in the federation of national princes under the presidency of the Papacy." Yet fifteen years later Farini was prime-minister of Victor Emmanuel II., king of Italy, in the unification of which Farini had himself figured as one of the most enthusiastic leaders. Farini's political evolution is typical of that of many of Italy's ablest statesmen.

The principal collection of Farini's letters heretofore published consisted of less than one hundred of his letters; the present three volumes contain over 850, besides those of his correspondents; and they come down only to 1851. In the many volumes that must follow we shall have still more important new documents, covering the period of Farini's advocacy of the Crimean expedition, his great achievements as dictator of Emilia in 1859, his work as Piedmontese Minister of the Interior at the time of the expedition of the Thousand in 1860, his royal lieutenancy at Naples in 1861, and his brief term as prime-minister, 1862–1863, which terminated with his death.

The first two volumes of the *Epistolario* have already served for the preparation of a new biography of Farini's "youth" down to 1849, by Luigi Messedaglia, published in the important collection, *Biblioteca Storica del Risorgimento Italiano.* It is a serious historical study, devoted primarily to Farini's labors as a physician, and based in considerable part upon unpublished medical papers of Farini furnished to the writer by Rava. The most valuable part of the volume is the preface by Rava, which contains, among other unpublished documents, seven letters addressed by Farini to Sansone d'Ancona in 1845, which came to light too late to be included in the *Epistolario.*

H. Nelson Gay.

Histoire de la Russie depuis les Origines jusqu'à nos Jours. Par ALFRED RAMBAUD. Sixième édition revue et complétée jusqu'en 1913 par ÉMILE HAUMANT, Professeur-adjoint à la Faculté des Lettres de Paris. (Paris: Hachette et Cie. 1914. Pp. 963.)

RAMBAUD'S *Histoire de la Russie* has for a long time been the only general history of Russia available to western readers; it has been translated into German and English. The recent English edition of Klyuchevsky's *History of Russia* has given to the English reader a fuller treatment of the early periods; and Klyuchevsky's work is the best general history produced by Russian scholarship. But these volumes only bring us to Catherine the Great. The new edition of Rambaud, which we have before us, has been revised and brought down to date by his son-in-law, Professor Haumant of the Sorbonne. Though of meagre proportions, this volume helps to fill the gap which confronts the student wishing to learn about Russia and unable to use the Russian books.

In his revision of the book, Mr. Haumant has conformed to the plan of the original: the treatment is by topics and the book is a small volume for reference. Because of the limits of space, only the most important events in Russian history can be noted and stated in brief outline. The greater attention is given to Russia's foreign relations, so that the account of Russian internal development is necessarily much condensed. Lack of perspective is evident in the last part of the volume, the pages written by Mr. Haumant himself.

The visit of the Russian emperor to Paris in 1894 was important: it helped to cement the alliance between the two countries. But three pages on this topic, containing detailed descriptions of receptions and military reviews, would hardly seem justified, especially when only five pages were allowed in the distribution of space, for the treatment of the topic "La Révolution" (of 1905–1906). In a history of Russia it is important to note the first Peace Congress at the Hague, which was convened on Russia's initiative; but five pages are inadequate to do justice to the congress if one is going to do more than mention it, and are out of proportion in a book of this size, covering the whole course of Russian history. Mr. Haumant's work heretofore has lain along the line of literature.

The summaries of recent problems and events are excellent. Of especial interest are the sections on the Balkans. The writer takes pains to follow the Near-Eastern question as it found reaction in Russia. Pan-Slavic sentiment in Russia was greatly weakened by the breaking up of the Balkan League, and by the conflict between Servia and Bulgaria. He points out that this was unfortunate both for Russia and for the Triple Entente; a Balkan League would have been an important factor for the balance of power in Europe.

In his treatment of recent Russian internal politics, the author takes

the view of the moderate liberal. He points out the many anomalies of the present situation, the continuation of the system and methods of administration of the old régime. The recent "nationalist" movement in Russia, which in many of its manifestations has come to represent reaction, is well analyzed and criticized. The political movement of 1905–1906 failed to secure civil and political rights as they are understood in western Europe. But as Mr. Haumant makes clear, there has been undoubted progress in the direction of liberty and a constitutional order. The Duma has had to suffer considerable curtailment of its powers, which were not as full as the Russian public had demanded; it has not been representative in any large sense, and has therefore at times found little support among the broader masses of the people. But by its very existence the Duma has had a great moral influence "which could not be either suppressed or replaced".

SAMUEL N. HARPER.

La Guerre des Balkans et l'Europe, 1912–1913. Par GABRIEL HANOTAUX. [Études Diplomatiques, deuxième série.] (Paris: Plon-Nourrit et Cie. 1914. Pp. vi, 457.)

THESE studies were written for French newspapers and periodicals during the grave crisis of the Balkan wars of 1912 and 1913, and consist of a discussion, from the standpoint of the diplomat, of the issues which presented themselves before the bar of the great powers and which were either solved and dismissed, or, after the more usual diplomatic fashion, adjourned to a more auspicious date and, in the meanwhile, ordered to be confined with their many restless predecessors in the international lockup. Reviewing always the most recent events—the strictly fresh, one is tempted to call them in the phrase of the butter-and-eggs merchants—the author gives us an informed, vigorous, and professionally circumspect analysis of each new situation as it affects the Triple Entente or the Triple Alliance and this or that member of these two great groups. In spite of keen penetration and great breadth of judgment he has, when all is said, presented us with a volume that belongs to the realm of journalism rather than to that of history. For it is the function of journalism to record the swift and instantaneous impressions of one who lives in the noisy centre of events, while history cultivates a deliberate method based on wide investigation and conducted in Olympian withdrawal from the strife of parties and of individuals. Mr. Hanotaux in the course of his volume considers everything that a close diplomatic student, such as he, had forced on his attention in the period involved— the rise of Bulgaria, Germans versus Slavs, Albania, the rôle of Rumania, etc.—and although his offering, when first brewed and served, was undoubtedly a cup of sparkling vintage, it has, one is in all frankness obliged to admit, already lost much of its life and in another half-year will certainly become quite flat and stale. Journalism, even though it be, as we have been assured, only a little more ephemeral than history, can expect no other fate.

The most interesting contribution of this book is what it reveals of the political psychology of the modern European diplomat. Mr. Hanotaux, as the world has not forgotten, has given his country many years of honorable and successful service and, though probably in gifts and acquisitions considerably above the average man in his profession, may still be taken as a fair specimen of the present-day *homo diplomaticus*. In reading through his book and feeling for the man behind the text the thing that constantly strikes the attention is that two opposed and struggling souls inhabit his body: a European soul, so to speak, which encourages him to take a large and generous viewpoint enveloping the good of all the people of Europe, and an underlying and old-fashioned French patriotic soul which desires the advantage of France at all costs and sees in every progress of a rival a blow aimed at the land of his special love. The novelty in this complicated mentality is the European over-soul, and that the French ex-diplomat has developed such an indwelling spirit is an encouraging sign of the times.

If the system of balance represented by the Triple Entente and the Triple Alliance has any moral meaning, it must be found in just this growing European consciousness from which should spring an increasing respect shared by people and diplomats for every nation, large and small, of the European world. When in these studies the French patriot asserts himself, suspicion, jealousy, and ill-will are not unlikely to cloud the author's judgment and obscure his outlook, but when the European, prompted by his new vision, raises his voice, the reader receives the comforting assurance that, in spite of the constant threat of war, yes, in spite of the monstrous actual war, which, as these lines are written, has risen irrepressibly, the age of peace and good will must come at last.

BOOKS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

The Rise of the American People: a Philosophical Interpretation of American History. By ROLAND G. USHER, Ph.D. (New York: The Century Company. 1914. Pp. xiii, 413.)

THIS is not a text-book. It is not a contribution in the strict sense of the word to American history. As its sub-title implies it is an essay, designed to present to the layman rather than to the special student not merely the broad outlines of our history from the earliest days, but such social, economic, and political factors within the outlines as have, in the author's opinion, characterized the movement—a slow one, according to Professor Usher—resulting at length in the establishment of a nation, now and since the Civil War truly and consciously united. There is thought as well as some degree of passion in the essay. Its analysis is at points clever. There is a self-conscious note now and again in which

the author appears to pride himself on avoiding old-fashioned and outworn views. Nevertheless the opinions expressed and the conclusions do not rest on careful study or on intimate knowledge of historic details and the complicated elements of various situations. Throughout the volume there is a strain of exaggeration and ill-judged statement not easy to explain in an author who seeks to know things as they really were. Professor Usher's fondness for cant phrases—"in very truth", "wondrous possibilities", "vast majority", "logic of facts", "fundamental causes", "basic difficulty", and a long series of others on page after page—is sure to weary even a patient reader and mars the style, if not the substance, of the book. The essay leaves a general impression of having afforded its author an amusing pastime in a field with which he is not sufficiently familiar.

The first seventy pages of the volume, which compass the colonial epoch and form a basis for what follows, mark the bias of the author. Here he is reverting to the point of view of an older generation of writers, for he gives no careful attention to either intercolonial relations or to the growing potency of British rule over the colonies. His remarks on trade relations with the West Indies—a commercial factor of importance only recently better understood—are sometimes good. But why should he term such relations "negative" (p. 38) and then admit that they were vital to colonial welfare (p. 41)? It is his constant effort to prove that the separate colonies were to all intents and purposes independent of the mother-country from the time of settlement, whereas it has been made clear through the studies of such scholars as Professors C. M. Andrews and Herbert Osgood and Mr. G. L. Beer that British rule in America was by 1760 far from the dead letter it was once supposed to be. His misleading discussion of population in 1760 (p. 37) is weakened by his careless foot-note reference to the map in Channing's *History of the United States* (I. 510).

Two matters the significance of which he is eager to explain have attracted a large share of Professor Usher's attention: the Declaration of Independence and the sectional struggle between North and South which resulted in the Civil War. It is not unfair to say that these topics have guided his facile pen and tinged to a marked degree his thought on such subjects as colonial sovereignty, states' rights, and the ideal of nationality. The Declaration was, in his view, an "explicit affirmation of the point most important to Americans in 1776—the absolute sovereignty of the individual states over their own citizens and their complete independence of each other" (p. 119). To a foot-note (p. 341) he lightly consigns James Wilson's equally explicit denial of the soundness of any such view. Finding some evidence in colonial days of what he terms "states' rights", he snatches at various states'-rights projects which suggested disunion from the days of the Revolution to the outbreak of war in 1861, and reaches the conclusion that there could be no nation in these United States until 1865. "We shall entirely miss the

most vital fact about this story", he declares, "if we allow ourselves to assume even for an instant that anything deserving the name of nation existed in North America in 1660, in 1760, in 1789, or even in 1861. American history does not describe the life-story of a nation, nor even the development or growth of a nation, but the very birth of the nation which, as such, is still in its infancy" (p. 5). When Patrick Henry declared himself not a Virginian but an American, he proclaimed a vision, not a fact (p. 72). So likewise did Webster in his debate with Hayne (pp. 226, 345). The Civil War made us a nation. In a word Lincoln became "the father of American nationality" (p. 345).

Long since, in 1902, the late William Garrott Brown remarked: "To know the thing itself should be our study; and the right study of it is thought and passion, not research alone." Possibly some such admirable notion may have been behind the projection of this book. However that may be, the ideal remains still unaccomplished, for Professor Usher's results can be termed neither good philosophy nor careful history.

HENRY BARRETT LEARNED.

Virginia under the Stuarts, 1607–1688. By THOMAS J. WERTENBAKER, Ph.D. (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1914. Pp. xi, 271.)

DR. WERTENBAKER'S volume is one among many proofs observable in recent years, that the history of Virginia in the seventeenth century, so long either entirely neglected, or studied only superficially, is receiving the steadily increasing attention which it deserves. He has taken the fullest advantage, not only of such invaluable collections of printed documents as Dr. Brown's *Genesis of the United States*, Dr. Tyler's *William and Mary College Quarterly*, and the *Virginia Historical Magazine*, but also of the works of the different scholars who have gone before him in the same field; and to the mass of illuminating information thus obtained, he has added the fruits of his own extensive personal researches.

The narrative is restricted to political events. It does not turn aside to enter any economic by-path; and the references to the institutional phases of the subject are always brief. Even the political survey is not a detailed one throughout. The critical periods alone are dwelt upon with something approaching amplitude.

The imperative demand for brevity and conciseness in so small a volume has resulted in several deficiencies. It has prevented the author from commenting freely on his more important facts where comment would have been appropriate, and would also have greatly increased the popular interest of the narrative; and secondly, it has left little room for presenting fully all sides of controverted questions. This is particularly noticeable in the treatment both of the minority faction in the London Company after 1619, and of the Acts of Navigation. That faction undoubtedly had some ground for their embittered opposition; and England could claim that, while the acts may have narrowed the colonial

market, they at least increased both her ability and her disposition to defend her subjects overseas.

Dr. Wertenbaker overemphasizes the supposed unhappy influence of the charter of 1606. The misfortunes that marred the first period of settlement would have occurred under the operation of any charter, however liberally and thoughtfully drafted, for they were really due to the Englishmen's complete ignorance at the start of the fundamental economic and sanitary principles of colonization, which they were so soon to learn from harsh practical experience.

Why was it that Berkeley, who failed so egregiously, and was detested by so many during his last administration, was so successful and so popular during his first? The contrast offers one of the problems of colonial history, upon which the present volume throws no satisfactory light. The author, however, does show very clearly for the first time why it was that such zealous reactionaries as the Robert Beverley of 1676 became such firm and such self-sacrificing supporters of the rights of the assembly and the people in after years.

It is a proof of Dr. Wertenbaker's ability to write history on a more ambitious scale, that the most admirable part of the present work is the only part in which he has permitted himself to enter at great length into details. The description of the Rebellion of 1676 is a complete one of every side of that dramatic movement. All the facts have been drawn from the original documents; and they are pieced together with such scholarly thoroughness and with such excellent literary skill, that it can be correctly said that the author has produced the most authoritative as well as the most interesting account of those stirring events yet written. No longer can it be asserted, as it has been by some historians of the period, that the causes of the rebellion are veiled in obscurity. They are brought out in these pages with remarkable force and vividness; and have really become more intelligible to us than the different reasons for friction which led up to the Revolution one hundred years later, although the latter movement, owing to its greater importance from every point of view, has naturally received far more attention.

PHILIP ALEXANDER BRUCE.

Narratives of the Witchcraft Cases, 1648–1706. Edited by GEORGE L. BURR, LL.D., Litt.D., Professor of Medieval History, Cornell University. [Original Narratives of Early American History, edited by J. Franklin Jameson.] (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1914. Pp. xviii, 467.)

TWO-THIRDS of this volume, exclusive of the index, are filled with the literature of the Salem delusion alone. Substantially the same proportion of space is devoted to the writings of the Mathers, father and son, and of their courageous critic, Robert Calef. Professor Burr has evidently disposed finally of the ancient doubt whether the champion of

sanity and justice was the junior or senior Robert Calef. The facsimiles of the signatures of the two men, reproduced here (opposite p. 292), clinch the argument in favor of the father.

This collection of narratives contains several which have become very rare and even unprocurable. Among these little-known narratives are Richard Chamberlain's *Lithobolia, or the Stone-throwing Devil*, published in 1698, and relating the antics of Satan at Portsmouth, New Hampshire, sixteen years earlier; also Thomas Brattle's *Letter* about the Salem excitement in 1692; and the *Modest Inquiry into the Nature of Witchcraft*, by Rev. John Hale, minister at Beverly, written in 1697–1698, and not published until 1702, after the author's death. Mr. Hale was among the ministers who promoted the Salem trials. When his own wife was accused of witchcraft he entertained doubts and began to suspect the nature of the popular delusion. This pamphlet in either its original edition or in its only reprint prior to this one (Boston, 1771) is a great rarity.

But the greatest contribution which this volume makes to the student of witchcraft in America is the initial publication of a manuscript by Cotton Mather entitled "A Brand pluck'd out of the Burning". The "brand" was one Mercy Short of Boston whose bewilderments were sympathetically watched by Mr. Mather during the fall and winter of 1692–1693, and after his custom minutely described in this manuscript, which was circulated among his friends. It lay among the papers in possession of his family until 1814 when his granddaughter presented it with many other manuscripts to the library of the American Antiquarian Society at Worcester, where it is now preserved. Mr. Mather's later narrative, entitled "Another Brand pluckt out of the Burning", the story of Margaret Rule's encounters with the devil (September, 1693), was published by Robert Calef with his comments in *More Wonders of the Invisible World*, which is reproduced here; but this story of Mercy Short comes as a message direct from Cotton Mather's mouth, and reveals, if that were necessary, the positive personality of the man, his mingled erudition, simplicity, and vanity.

These narratives have been wisely so arranged as to preserve the general effect of a chronological sequence. First, the fifth chapter of Rev. Increase Mather's *Essay for the recording of Illustrious Providences* relates certain "Preternatural Happenings in New England" between 1662 and 1683.

Next follow the New York cases of Ralph and Mary Hall at Setauket (Brookhaven, Long Island) in 1665, and of Katharine Harrison of West Chester in 1670.

Chamberlain's stone-throwing devil at Portsmouth, 1682, is then introduced, and that is followed by two stories from Pennsylvania, one of 1684, the other of 1701. Cotton Mather's *Memorable Providences relating to Witchcrafts and Possessions* tells of various wiles of the Great Adversary, but chiefly of his persecution of the Goodwin children at Boston in 1688–1689.

All the rest of the volume is filled with the narrative of 1692–1693 with the exception of the last ten pages, devoted to the case of Grace Sherwood in Virginia, in 1706.

Perhaps the only prominent case of colonial witchcraft which is not represented among these narratives is the trial, or rather trials, of Mrs. Elizabeth Godman at New Haven, first in 1653 and again in 1655. The story is fully told in the records of that colony (II. 29–36, 151–152), and consequently it may have been considered as not strictly a narrative, but rather a court record.

Inasmuch as Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, Pennsylvania, and Virginia are so directly identified with the stories of delusion here given, it may be proper to remind the reader of a fact which the arrangement of selections does not make plain, that before the outbreak at Salem, the largest number of accusations of witchcraft had been made among the settlers of what is now Connecticut, and that the rulers of New Haven evinced, in such circumstances, a spirit of unusual moderation and common sense. The first victim of this superstition in New England was Alse Young, hanged at Hartford, May 26, 1647.[1] Professor Burr embodies this fact in a foot-note on page 408, but the name of the sufferer is not in the index, which in general is admirably thorough. On page xvii of the introduction it will be observed that in the parenthetical reference to "pp. 247 ff.", the number should be 255 ff.

Professor Burr's editing is all that could be desired. The notes are copious, accurate, and illuminating wherever light is needed. The student who joins these narratives to the records printed in Upham's *Salem Witchcraft*, Woodward's *Records of Salem Witchcraft*, and in the brilliant discussions of A. C. Goodell and G. H. Moore, will have before him the materials for a fairly complete history of New England witchcraft delusions.

Professor Burr intimates, moreover, that when the publication, *Records and Files of the Quarterly Courts of Essex County*, now appearing under the able editorship of Mr. George Francis Dow, reaches the era of the frenzy of 1692–1693, all the documents that exist concerning the delusion in Salem and vicinity will be put in print in that work.

C. H. Levermore.

Narratives of the Indian Wars, 1675–1699. Edited by Charles H. Lincoln, Ph.D. [Original Narratives of Early American History.] (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1913. Pp. xii, [1], 316.)

There are seven reprints in this volume on the Indian wars of New England from 1675 to 1699; being a selection of the rare Indian narratives sedulously sought for by collectors. No. 1 is *A Relacion of the*

[1] Between this event and the last indictment in Connecticut in 1697 there were in that colony 28 accusations of witchcraft and 9 executions. The last execution was that of Mary Barnes of Farmington in 1663.

Indyan Warre, by Mr. Easton, of Roade Isld., 1675, from the original manuscript in the New York State Library. It was first printed at Albany, in 1858, in an edition of one hundred copies, edited by Franklin B. Hough. No. 2 is *The Present State of New-England with Respect to the Indian War* (London, 1675). The imprint date is old style and the tract was actually published early in 1676. In no. 3 we have *A Continuation* (London, 1676), and in no. 4, *A New and Further Narrative* (London, 1676). Nos. 2–4 are by "N. S.", believed to be Nathaniel Saltonstall. There are two issues of no. 4, textually alike, but with varying title-pages. No. 5 is Richard Hutchinson's *The Warr in New-England visibly ended* (London, 1677). The first reprints of nos. 2 and 3 were published by Samuel G. Drake, in 1833, but the sale was unsuccessful. As far as possible, Drake recalled the edition, and, in 1836, used the remainder of these two pieces, added reprints of nos. 4 and 5, and *A True Account of the most Considerable Occurrences* (London, 1676); and appended his compilation of *Chronicles of the Indians of America*—a chronological dictionary of Indian events. The 1836 edition was limited to "some 250 Copies". In 1867 Drake brought out a new edition with additions, but omitted the *Chronicles* as out of date. This edition contains reprints of nos. 2–5; also *A True Account, News from New-England* (London, 1673); and *A farther brief and true Narrative* (London, 1676). The last two pieces had not been reprinted before.

The volume under review has taken nos. 2–5 from Drake's edition of 1867. The general editor states (note, p. vii) concerning these: "The text of them presented in Drake's *Old Indian Chronicle*, which has all the appearance of close conformity to the originals, was taken as printer's copy. Collation with the rare originals was not practicable at the time when the book was prepared. When the opportunity for it was secured, it was discovered too late that Drake's text differed very widely from his originals in capitalization, and sometimes varied from them in spelling. But though correction of all these differences had become impracticable, all significant errors have been corrected." The reviewer has during a period of twenty years noticed the same aberrations from originals in all of Drake's reprints which he has tested. He is able to state that Drake's 1836 edition, while not exact, conforms more nearly to the originals than the 1867 edition. He has compared no. 5 in the present work with the original edition; has found over one hundred variations in capitalization, spelling, and punctuation, but nothing that affects historical accuracy of statement.

The sixth piece is Mrs. Mary Rowlandson's *Narrative* of her captivity (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1682), second and earliest extant edition. It is reprinted from the excessively rare original in the Prince collection of the Boston Public Library. A facsimile, from plates indifferently done, was edited, in 1903, by Henry S. Nourse and John E. Thayer. The seventh and last piece is Cotton Mather's *Decennium*

Luctuosum (1688 to 1698), reprinted from the nearly unique original (Boston, 1699) in the Boston Public Library, which has only a pen and ink title-page; but the present reprint omits Mather's sermon on "Observable Things" as not worth while. Mather himself reprinted the *Decennium* in his *Magnalia* (London, 1702), and it is also in the reprinted editions of that *magnum opus*, of 1820 and 1853.

The composite volume of *Narratives of the Indian Wars* has useful introductions and textual, personal, geographical, elucidative, and critical annotations that are valuable. The original Winthrop manuscripts in the Massachusetts Historical Society are rich in unprinted information on King Philip's War and the editor of this volume would have found in them the answers to some of his uncertainties. The information from Hennepin, which the editor could not locate in that author (p. 216, note 2), is from the *New Discovery* (ch. XXXVI., see Thwaites's edition, II. 590 ff.). A facsimile of the "White Hills" issue of the "Map of New-England" from the Boston edition, 1677, of Hubbard's *Narratives of the Troubles with the Indians*, is the frontispiece and principal reproduction presented. The volume has a good index.

VICTOR HUGO PALTSITS.

Athanase de Mézières and the Louisiana-Texas Frontier, 1768–1780. Documents published for the first time, from the original Spanish and French manuscripts, chiefly in the archives of Mexico and Spain; translated into English; edited and annotated by HERBERT EUGENE BOLTON, Ph.D., Professor of American History, University of California. In two volumes. (Cleveland: Arthur H. Clark Company. 1914. Pp. 351; 392.)

ROMANCE and diplomatic controversy have made prominent the deeds of La Salle and St. Denis on the early Louisiana-Texas frontier. The present publication is designed to do the same for a third Frenchman, whose active career belongs to the period when Louisiana was transferred to Spanish control. De Mézières facilitated this transfer, worked to attach the Indians to the new Spanish régime, explored the debatable ground between Louisiana and Texas, favored reciprocal commerce between the two provinces, and proposed measures to develop their common resources, control the Indians, and repel the advances of the dreaded English. Loyal to his native country, he so gained the confidence of his new superiors that they proposed to transfer him from Natchitoches to the governorship of Texas.

These facts and a wealth of similar data for the history of both provinces we may gather from these two substantial volumes, which may be regarded as a by-product of the Carnegie Institution, the universities of Texas and California, and the Bureau of American Ethnology. Professor Bolton combines the results of labors in these three fields, although emphasizing the last named, and utilizes as well the

publications of fellow-workers (some of them his students), to whom he makes generous acknowledgment. The work initiates a series to be known as *Spain in the West*, and the publishers have brought it out in a form worthy of their established reputation.

The brief preface is followed by an "Historical Introduction" of over a hundred pages that for the casual reader will constitute the most valuable feature of the work. The major portion of this is devoted to classifying and locating the Indian tribes of Texas and vicinity, during which the editor makes extensive use of data previously gathered for the Bureau of Ethnology. He describes French and Spanish efforts to control the Indians during the first century of contact, and the Spanish attempts to prevent contraband trade with the natives and with Santa Fé. With the transfer of Louisiana to Spain, that nation introduces a new Indian policy, and at the same time proposes to change the form of government for its frontier provinces. This policy is designed to secure the allegiance of the tribes newly brought under Spanish control; and to do so, the authorities plan to expel renegade creoles and intrusive Englishmen, regulate trade and inter-tribal relations, and assist, wherever possible, in civilizing the natives. De Mézières was a most fitting agent for this task, and the latter part of the introduction is devoted to a sketch of his career from 1769 to 1779, when he was thus engaged.

The documents, fifty-two in number, are largely from the Archivo General of Mexico, the Archivo General of Seville, the Archivo Historico Nacional of Madrid, and the Bancroft Collection, with two from the British Museum and one each from the Bexar Archives and the archives of the diocese of San Antonio, Texas. They are grouped in ten divisions, suggested by the Frenchman's manifold activities, and throw great light upon the contemporary political, social, and economic conditions of that frontier area. The portion printed does not include all the material relating to De Mézières, and the editor confesses that the task of selection has been a difficult one. One who feels overwhelmed by the mass of facts presented by the text and foot-notes, may be reassured by the carefully prepared index of more than fifty pages. This is doubly useful because the editor groups all variant spellings of Indian and other proper names and makes frequent cross-references. A good-sized map of Texas and the neighboring territory forms the frontispiece of the first volume. This is compiled from original data and shows the position of different tribal groups during the eighteenth century, together with settlements, missions, presidios, explorers' routes, and ordinary highways. A few signatures and one page of a report are given in facsimile.

Despite the abundant opportunity for errata, few are noted. Some in the first volume are corrected in the second. In addition typographical errors occur in volume I., page 84, where "1769" should obviously be 1760; on page 125, where the figures of the date "1777–5" should be transposed; and on page 127, note 152, where the Spanish form

"Sevilla" is used instead of the English. The reviewer notes that the titles of two articles cited in note 23, page 33, are not quite accurate. In the second volume, "volume I.", should be inserted in note 271, page 234. In general, however, one cannot speak too highly of the care and scholarship displayed by the editor in his task, and one will await with interest the appearance of succeeding volumes in a series that promises so much for the history of the Southwest.

ISAAC JOSLIN COX.

Jahrbuch der Deutsch-Amerikanischen Historischen Gesellschaft von Illinois. Herausgegeben von JULIUS GOEBEL. [Deutsch-Amerikanische Geschichtsblätter, Jahrgang 1913, vol. XIII.] (Chicago: the Society. 1914. Pp. 359.)

THE present *Jahrbuch*, the second under the editorship of Professor Goebel, contains a well-sifted collection of studies and materials, without exception important and interesting. The first, by I. E. Voigt, is a welcome study of the life and works of "Talvj". This mystifying pseudonym, composed of the initials of her name, was used by Therese A. L. von Jakob, whose brilliant mind was a quickening force in Germany and America during the first half of the nineteenth century. She was the daughter of a German professor of philosophy at Charkov, at St. Petersburg, and at Halle. In 1826 Edward Robinson, instructor in Hebrew at Andover Seminary, came to Halle to study under Gesenius, and at the house of Professor von Jakob he met Therese, who became his wife in 1828. She came to America well fitted for active participation in the intellectual advancement of her adopted country. When her husband founded the *Biblical Repository* in 1831 (continued as the *Bibliotheca Sacra* since 1843), and made it the chief exponent of German theological and philosophical thought, his wife proved an able assistant, translating and interpreting the numerous German contributions to the review. Mr. Robinson became a pioneer and authority in the geography of the Bible; Talvj translated his work into German in 1853–1854. But this assistance by no means excluded independent literary effort. Admirable and sound is her best historical work (1847), *Geschichte der Colonisation von Neu-England, 1607–1692*, sympathetic, yet unbiassed and discerning. Novels depicting contemporary life, translations (as of Pickering's book concerning the languages of the American Indians, with annotations by Talvj), poems, and essays, flowed from her pen; she was an esteemed contributor to leading American and German magazines; and her personal influence was great during the period 1837–1863, when her husband was professor of Biblical literature at Union Theological Seminary in New York, and her home was the resort of men of letters and learning, and of students who sought inspiration and instruction. The second number in the *Jahrbuch* is a carefully written article by Albert J. W. Kern, on Jacob Leisler. This is followed by "Neue Dokumente zur Geschichte der Massenauswanderung im Jahre

1709", by the editor, Julius Goebel. These documents, from the archives of the principality Nassau-Weilburg, besides throwing light on economic and social conditions of the period, prove that English agents gave encouragement to German emigrants (as here Mr. Davenant, English envoy at Frankfort-on-the-Main), and that history must throw a large part of the responsibility upon them for the large exodus of Palatines in 1709–1710, whose numbers caused embarrassment in London for some time. "The Germans of Iowa and the Two-Year Amendment of Massachusetts", by F. J. Herriott, is an important contribution to our knowledge of the bearing of the German vote of the Middle West upon the political situation in the crisis of 1860. Mr. Herriott shows that the leaders of the Republican party in Iowa considered the German vote indispensable for victory at the polls, adopting every expedient to reassure and satisfy the German leaders, and nominating the most influential of the Germans of Iowa, the "forty-eighter" N. J. Rusch, as lieutenant-governor in 1860; and he narrates their struggle to counteract the effect of the Two-Year Amendment passed by the Republicans of Massachusetts, by which the foreigner after becoming naturalized should be compelled to wait two years before securing the privilege of voting. The last article, "Aus dem Tagebuch eines Achtundvierzigers", we owe to Professor Otto Heller, who encouraged Dr. Enno Sander, an ardent participant in the revolution of 1848–1849, to look back and dictate to him what he remembered of that period of great hopes, of slight fulfillment, yet of great moment for its bearing upon the future. The diary is written in a racy style, and gives a fascinating picture of persons and events in that brief, but critical struggle, which sent practically all of its surviving leaders to this country.

A. B. Faust.

Guide to the Materials in London Archives for the History of the United States since 1783. By Charles O. Paullin, of the Carnegie Institution of Washington, and Frederic L. Paxson, Professor of American History in the University of Wisconsin. (Washington, D. C.: The Carnegie Institution of Washington. 1914. Pp. xi, 642.)

This volume, which does honor to the Carnegie Institution, to the Director of its Department of Historical Research, and to its compilers, is a joint production. Dr. Paullin of the Institution contributed six months to the work and Professor Paxson of the University of Wisconsin three months; and Professor Fryer of McGill University and Mr. Parker, now of the Archives Department, Ottawa, assisted materially. The labor was divided as well as possible, however, and great care was taken to minimize the disadvantages of division. The *Guide*, which extends in nearly all cases to 1860, covers the Foreign Office, Home Office, War Office, Colonial Office, Privy Council, House

of Lords, Admiralty, Audit Office, Board of Trade, Customs, General Post Office, High Court of Admiralty, the Treasury, and the British Museum manuscripts. Of the value of these documents it cannot be necessary to speak at length. The diplomatic despatches, for instance, were from men of ability close to the heart of things, exempt in many cases from the blinding passions of the participants and under a stringent obligation to observe carefully and write with scrupulous fidelity; and all the papers possess in their varying degrees and for their various purposes a substantial importance. The field is almost appalling in extent, while the labor of reporting upon it was very exacting in regard to quality; and the compilers merit hearty praise for the patient and scholarly work accomplished. The reviewer has been able to compare transcripts and notes—particularly from "F. O. America" and "F. O. Mexico" papers—with the analyses of the corresponding volumes presented in the *Guide*, and also to test less thoroughly the Admiralty work, and, besides finding himself almost always satisfied, has in many cases felt admiration at the deftness as well as fidelity with which the documents have been handled. A dozen words often represent hours of thoughtful labor. At the same time it must be said—not as a criticism upon the compilers but as a hint to the users of the volume—that it has its limitations. This was indeed practically inevitable. It had to be prepared with a moderate expenditure of time and printed within a moderate compass; and there are bounds to both human knowledge and the human power of attention. Cases have been found in which pertinent matters have been passed over, and others in which the descriptions are somewhat inadequate or possibly somewhat misleading. These have arisen occasionally perhaps from an oversight or from failing to perceive all the bearings of a document or passage, as only a special student of the subject could fairly be expected to do; but usually the cause has doubtless been the need of conciseness. Moreover it was found impracticable (see p. 10) to try to list all of the documents relating to the United States that are scattered through series relating primarily to other countries; and the preface states that "many series of documents are not described", though the indexes, catalogues, and official lists referring to them are fully mentioned. Hence while scores of papers having apparently only a very slight importance are specified, some of notable value—especially those preserved in files where one would not expect to find them—might be overlooked by the investigator, should he rely too closely on the *Guide*. Now the failure of an historian to use essential documents is peculiarly unfortunate, for it is less likely to be detected than misstatements yet quite as liable to cause wrong conclusions. For this reason whatever seems to be a satisfactory substitute for the tedious examination of all the possible sources is of course dangerous, and the suggestion must be made not to use the *Guide* blindly, however great its value. The inquirer must still be alert, persistent, and laborious, and so Dr. Jameson himself intimates in his

excellent preface. To these remarks must be added strong appreciation of the introduction—which offers much essential preliminary information to the scholar wishing to consult these archives—and of the fine index.

JUSTIN H. SMITH.

Writings of John Quincy Adams. Edited by WORTHINGTON CHAUNCEY FORD. Volume III., 1801–1810. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1914. Pp. xxiv, 555.)

THE third installment of John Quincy Adams's *Writings* covers what was perhaps the most critical period in his long public career. Immediately upon his return from Prussia he entered political life. In April, 1802, he was elected a member of the senate of Massachusetts; in November, he narrowly missed an election to the federal House of Representatives; in the following February, he was elected to the United States Senate. Chosen to represent a Federalist constituency, he did not hesitate to support measures recommended by President Jefferson. For this independent course he paid the inevitable penalty. The trials which befell him were, he admitted to his mother, severe beyond any that he ever was before called to meet. In June, 1808, he found himself so hopelessly at odds with his constituents that he resigned his seat. A year later he was appointed minister to Russia by President Madison.

The personal history unfolded in these letters will be familiar to those who have read Adams's *Diary*; yet many phases of personal politics are illuminated by passages written in a confidential vein. Occasionally, too, information of a general nature may be gleaned from these letters; but on the whole they contribute little that is new to the history of the times.

Those who would understand what Josiah Quincy called "the peculiar texture" of Adams's mind will do well to read the letters which passed between him and the overseers of Harvard College relative to the Boylston Professorship of Rhetoric and Oratory. Adams was convinced that "the bar was not his element", but he never doubted his ability to contribute to "belles lettres". Conscientious to a fault in this as in all matters, he read laboriously in the classics, in preparation for his duties; yet he never exhibited any marked literary taste or imagination. On witnessing an eclipse of the moon his fancy took no higher flight than this: "The fowls roosted. The lowing herd wound slowly o'er the lea. The western horizon with a sky perfectly serene looked as if it had been charged with one of the heaviest thunder clouds. The moon appeared like a patch of court plaister upon the face of Heaven."

On the other hand, Adams did entertain serious doubts as to his usefulness in public life. His fundamental principles, he declared, were devotion to the Union and independence of party obligations. He deplored at all times the baneful influence of party. Referring to his

break with the Federalists of Massachusetts, he wrote in a short autobiographical sketch, "I discharged my duty to my country, but I committed the unpardonable sin against *Party*." Yet in almost the same breath he remarked, with a flash of self-scrutiny, "Perhaps I have too much indulged the suggestions of my own judgment, and paid too little deference to that of other men." The future biographer of Adams will hardly venture to deny this soft impeachment.

The work of the editor has been on the whole well done, although it seems at times less complete than in the earlier volumes. Here and there references to events are suffered to go without explanation. A reference, for example, to the "cause for which I came here", in a letter from Washington, March 5, 1809, can be made intelligible, of course, by turning to the *Memoirs*; but the casual reader perhaps will not know that this was the important case of Fletcher *v.* Peck, in which Adams appeared as counsel for the defendant. So, too, an allusion to the decision of Judge Davis in the district court at Salem in 1809 deserves a brief foot-note, for the case was an important test of the constitutionality of the embargo. Two slight errors have been noted. The editor prints *Porte Folio* as a single word, though neither Adams nor the editor of the periodical did so. Breckenridger (p. 159) is an obvious slip for Breckenridge.

ALLEN JOHNSON.

Bull Run: its Strategy and Tactics. By R. M. JOHNSTON. (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1913. Pp. xiv, 293.)

IF it is well to resurrect the story of the Bull Run campaign, then we must bear witness that this book gives a good narrative of events as they occurred; that the account has been verified by a study of the ground, that well-known sources of information have been consulted, and that conflicting stories have been fairly decided.

But Bull Run races will probably not be run again, and the event loses much of its interest as it ceases to be a lesson. Its three months' volunteers will parade no more upon the page of American history to furnish examples of panic rout, vain sacrifice, and the frivolity of the armed crowd. In the art of command from high to low, never again shall we see the unhappy tactics of Sherman and Heintzelman or the empty orders of McDowell and Beauregard. Our volunteer army bill has changed the one, and lieutenants are now so well dosed with the subject of military orders and the attack over open ground, that it has been feared that they know too much, not too little.

However if we must draw these shadows from their long repose we should bear in mind the wisdom of our later day. When we summon the soldiers of 1861 to appear before the bar of history let us take account of the state of military art as it was known to them. Let us give to McDowell and Beauregard a chance to reply that Napoleon the Great

at Wagram, at Auerstädt, at Ligny or Charleroi could be convicted of the same faults. The criticism of the author might be more gentle.

It is good practice for writers on strategy and tactics to define their meaning for these much-abused terms. The campaign abounds with curious if obsolete questions of tactics and strategy, not always stated as such, but hidden in the mass of narrative. The word tactics is not often used and further elucidation would be interesting in such matters as these: When artillery was used in "searching" woods and positions, apparently with approval of the author; something might be added to the discussion of the tactics of attack and defense when we know from the author's figures that McDowell crossed Bull Run with enough men to line the Warrenton pike from Stone Bridge to Dogan's house at six to the yard, and Beauregard had enough men in action to stand at nine to the yard from Robinson's to Henry's and on to Chinn's; and what of the position of Jackson on the reverse slope of the fire-swept zone, not on the military crest—a tactical expedient often noticed in this war, and quite opposed to theory; the field of fire of the Federal guns on Henry Hill; the negative results of superior artillery (regulars) against "Shanks" Evans's smooth-bores; the effect of Imboden's smooth-bores at Henry Hill. The author uses the word "strategy" with frequency, and thereby adds to our curiosity, for it is a recent word, not over seventy years old in our language, not used in its French form by Napoleon himself but greatly overworked by his commentators. Perhaps the best idea comes from Kipling's statement, "The essence of strategy is forethought." Under such a view, however, the book would condemn as "weak in strategy" the leader who shows its best example. When the North had 80,000 men available in West Virginia and Virginia, and the South had less than half that number, it would appear to be strategy to concentrate a superior Southern force against the largest Federal fraction. The plan seems to have belonged to Beauregard more than to any other.

With strategy as our theme we miss a strategic study of the frontier and a discussion of the influence of localities (capitals). If McDowell had used forethought he would not have put in front the troops which had the shortest march to make; he would have made crossings over the insignificant Cub Run, instead of marching 18,000 men over the narrow defile at the bridge, behind which he passed two whole days; he would have foreseen that 12,000 men marching on a country road at one man to the yard would take hours to form for attack.

Among brilliant reviews of Bull Run is one which has not been noticed by the author. Colonel John S. Mosby in the New York *Sun* reminds us that Ashby's cavalry joined from the valley on the day after the battle, making say 25,000 cavalry; that the cavalry was sufficient to have completely demoralized the retreat, crossed at Seneca Ford, fifteen miles from Washington, and cut it off from the north. Colonel Mosby contends that McDowell's order was what the Southern generals were

praying for, and did not take advantage of when they found it had been issued; that at 4:00 p. m. the Southern generals were six miles nearer Washington than the beaten armies of the North.

The author anticipates the development of field intrenchments when he charges Beauregard with neglect to do what Lee did not do at Antietam.

Some carelessness is shown in omitting scales and compass bearings from some maps and in such statements as that "Arlington was the property of Robert E. Lee", and the remark and foot-note on page 93 from which it would appear that Major Palmer commanded a battalion of cavalry consisting of sixteen squadrons, each squadron of half a company. Palmer commanded two squadrons, and bivouacked at Centerville on the night of July 21. Bull Run is referred to as a river.

EBEN SWIFT.

The United States Federal Internal Tax History from 1861 to 1871. By HARRY EDWIN SMITH, Ph.D. [Hart, Schaffner, and Marx Prize Essays.] (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1914. Pp. xix, 357.)

To this book was awarded the first prize presented by Messrs. Hart, Schaffner, and Marx for the year 1912. It is a very valuable contribution to our economic history. It contains the best history of the income tax legislation during our Civil War that has hitherto been published. This is high praise, since the subject had been previously treated by Professor Seligman. The author (at p. 87) joins issue, with apparent success, upon the latter's statement that the repeal of the income tax was defeated in the Forty-First Congress by the vote of 105 to 104 (Seligman's *Income Tax*, first ed., p. 467).

In the book are also to be found the Congressional, administrative, and judicial histories of the inheritance tax, the tax on the gross receipts of corporations, bank taxes, stamp taxes, license taxes, liquor taxes, taxes upon manufactures, and other internal revenue taxes during the same period. It shows research not only through the *Congressional Globe* and Congressional documents, but also in the records of the departments and the files of the leading New York newspapers. It also explains many of the rulings by the commissioner of internal revenue, which are of importance not only as the practical construction of the statutes, but also as showing the reasons for some of the subsequent amendments. Annexed is a valuable series of tables, collected from Executive and Congressional documents, which are not easily accessible. No one, whether scholar or statesman, upon whom is imposed the duty of investigating any of these or cognate subjects, can afford to overlook the book.

The style is drier than the exigencies of the subject require. The work contains a number of awkward expressions, such as are unfor-

tunately not uncommon in the theses of our recent college graduates, and which may be due to the recent neglect of the study of the classics.

The only notable omission is the history of the Whiskey Ring. This is treated with unnecessary abbreviation. If adequately and judiciously set forth, it would have made the work less weary to the reader, and the author would have rendered an important service by showing how well founded were the charges made in contemporary publications and in the courts as to the implication of some of the highest and most influential officers in the United States in the conspiracy. He would have furnished valuable and interesting material for the histories of the cities of New York and St. Louis.

We can find no reference to the dispute as to the constitutionality of the cotton tax imposed during the Civil War, which was attacked as a duty upon exports; nor to the Treasury fee of four cents a pound charged for a license to buy cotton then in a state that had joined in the Confederacy and to transport the same into a loyal state. This, although in its effect similar to a tax and not imposed by Congress, was sustained by the Supreme Court in Hamilton *v.* Dillon (21 Wall. 73, 22 L. Ed. 528).

A few errors belong to a class not unusually found in the books of laymen who discuss judicial decisions. At page 35 the writer speaks of two cases brought before the courts, which he describes as the "Georgia Case" and the "Direct Tax Case". His citations are rulings of comptrollers of the Treasury. And he omits the case of U. S. *v.* Louisiana (123 U. S. 32), decided December 24, 1887, which is in harmony with one of these comptroller's rulings.

The citations of cases in the federal, district, and circuit courts, are usually from the *Internal Revenue Record*, a periodical which few libraries contain. Had he taken the trouble to add references to the regular reports and to the reprint entitled *Federal Cases*, the author by the use of a table of cases would have expended only a few more hours of labor and he would have saved his readers much time and needless irritation. A table of the cases cited in the book would also have increased its value.

His bibliography, although it mentions Boutwell's *Manual of the Direct and Excise Tax System of the United States*, together with Bump's *Internal Revenue Statutes now in Force*, omits Foster and Abbot on the income tax of 1894. This was the only volume published before 1913 that contained the text of all the statutes and a complete digest of the decisions of the courts and the rulings by the commissioner of internal revenue upon the income taxes of the Civil War.

Confederate Portraits. By GAMALIEL BRADFORD. (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1914. Pp. xix, 291.)

HERE is a volume interesting and significant but for which the word "portraits" in the title claims too much. The claim becomes slightly pretentious through the coinage of a new term for what is done in these

essays—"psychography". The origination of a new type of expression is perhaps the rarest achievement of art and the claim to have done so inevitably challenges severe scrutiny.

Observe Mr. Bradford's method. First of all he deliberately repudiates consecutive narrative. There is no dramatic movement in his essays. The reader stands still and is bombarded by observations. One suspects that the method is based in the author's mind on a philosophical conception left over from a more metaphysical age, the conception of character not as a plastic thing forever in formation or destruction but as a predetermined substance contained in circumstance as in a vase. For people who hold such views the sequence of events is almost immaterial; what they want is a logical pattern conceived once for all with time omitted. Furthermore, Mr. Bradford makes a point of rejecting all debatable matter. Ask him whether Longstreet bungled Gettysburg and he replies, in substance, "Let us waive that; my notion of his character, from the things he said, and some of the things he did, and from what others thought of him, is so-and-so." All very well when the character involved is not problematical. Stuart, for example, will make a charming essay—as here he does—no matter what method is used nor how slight the circumstantial basis. Much the same might be said of the essays on Beauregard and Semmes. It is in the treatment of problematical subjects—in this case, J. E. Johnston, Longstreet, Benjamin, Stephens, Toombs—that the method of "psychography" meets its test. Is it better fitted than established methods to discover the strange harmony, if harmony there be, that, in such characters, underlies the discord?

A typical instance of the "psychographical" method is the essay on Stephens—who, by the way, in his several aspects, reminds us of Cicero, Voltaire, Leopardi, Amiel, even Plato, to say nothing of Byron and Galileo—and who is here pictured in a series of descriptions topically arranged without the least intimation that the sequence of his deeds is a necessary condition to relating properly his various sides. In fact, the method might be briefly described as an attempt to portray the characters of men without determining the sequence of their deeds.

One need not insist that history hitherto has not employed the psychographical method. What is more to the point, considering Mr. Bradford's general attitude, neither has literature. It is as far from Thackeray as from Gibbon. What would remain of the portrait of Mrs. Crawley if we subtracted from the causes of the effect all Thackeray's delicate care to have us perceive the exact deviation from the familiar in the curve of her conduct? It is because he has not learned this lesson that Mr. Bradford's work—pleasing as it is, and it is very pleasing—lacks force. Compare his best essay with, say, Matthew Arnold's "Falkland" or Pater's "Leonardo", and we realize that psychography is no improvement upon literature.

What then are the virtues of this volume? To begin with, the de-

lightful one of being readable—which too many books of history are not. Also its tone. In a way nothing could be more praiseworthy than the tone of cordial sympathy that pervades every essay. But the chief virtue is Mr. Bradford himself. He has a conviction, he feels it strongly and he communicates it—the conviction that personality as such, with all its inconsistencies, fanaticisms, illusions, is one of the prime historic forces. The final value of his book is not so much in its contributions toward the ultimate portraits of the Confederate leaders as in the stimulating charge of his own hearty conviction that historical portraiture is worth while. At the moment, when history seems to be reacting somewhat against the ultra-economic school, when it seems to be taking a psychological turn, Mr. Bradford may even be thought of as one of the first fruits of a new day. One may risk it that he will be read with pleasure by the late president of the Historical Association. Ought not that to content him for his labor?

N. W. Stephenson.

Contemporary American History, 1877–1913. By Charles A. Beard, Associate Professor of Politics, Columbia University. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1914. Pp. 397.)

The scope of this book is strictly limited. "I have made no attempt to present an 'artistically balanced' account of the last thirty-five years", says the author, "but have sought rather to furnish a background for the leading issues of current politics and to enlist the interest of the student in the history of the most wonderful period in American development. The book is necessarily somewhat 'impressionistic' and in part it is based upon materials which have not been adequately sifted and evaluated. Nevertheless, I have endeavored to be accurate and fair, and at the same time to invite on the part of the student some of that free-play of the mind which Matthew Arnold has shown to be so helpful in literary criticism."

Despite this apology, we have a right to expect in a supposedly scholarly treatise a more or less balanced treatment of the period, and it is a surprise to find that the author all but neglects economic history. In two chapters, the one on the Growth of Dissent from the Civil War to 1896, the other on the Revival of Dissent after the Spanish War, there is no treatment of the financial panics of 1873, 1893, and 1907. One searches in vain for a consideration of such important subjects as the increase in the supply of gold, the rise of prices, and the slower rise of wages. The development of the West is presented merely as a matter of growth of population and formation of new states, with no discussion of the Indian question, the disposition of the public lands, and the enormous increase in the volume of the crops, and very little on the conservation movement, while for the country at large foreign and domestic commerce, and mining and lumbering, are totally neglected.

Apparently Professor Beard believes that to furnish his "background" he may safely disregard these fundamental factors, and that in the consideration which he gives to the formation of labor unions, the question of free silver, and the development of the trusts he has given adequate attention to economic movements. Perhaps here we should recognize the "impressionistic" character of the book, to which the author himself confesses, and his invitation to students to exercise "that free play of the mind", helpful in literary criticism.

Diplomatic history also is largely ignored, even such episodes as dollar diplomacy and the rise and progress of Pan-Americanism not being deemed "elementary facts" of importance. Twenty-seven pages cover the history of parties and party issues from 1877 to 1896, a chapter of thirty-five pages is devoted to the single campaign of 1896, and another chapter, slightly larger, to the campaign of 1912. Aside from this disproportionate allotment of space, however, the political chapters are well done, though somewhat loosely written. In the treatment of federal legislation lies the real strength of the book. The chapters of greatest value are those on the Revolution in Politics and Law, the Growth of Dissent, and the Revival of Dissent, but the last two of these are, as we have seen, weak on the economic side.

The almost total absence of foot-notes is unfortunate, for it not only deprives the reader of access to the author's sources of information, which he would like to "sift" for himself, but also adds to the "impressionistic" nature of the book. Sweeping generalizations, without facts or arguments in their defense, some of them open to serious question, to say the least, are numerous. Thus we are told that the discontent of the two decades, 1876 to 1896, was confined principally to the small farmers (p. 147), that the American people enjoy wars beyond measure (p. 199), that Great Britain was wholly in the right in her boundary dispute with Venezuela (p. 202), that economic interests led to intervention in Cuba (p. 204), and that the acquisition of the Philippines was simply an episode in the development of commercial interests in the Orient (p. 224).

The apparently hasty and ill-considered use of material may be due to the rapid appearance of the author's publications, but we are forced to the conclusion that his *Contemporary American History*, while valuable and stimulating in many respects, good in spots, is poorly grounded, unauthoritative, and far too restricted in point of view. Unless used with discrimination, it cannot furnish a true "background" to contemporary politics and government.

The Americans in the Philippines: a History of the Conquest and First Years of Occupation, with an introductory Account of the Spanish Rule. By JAMES A. LEROY. With an Introduction by WILLIAM HOWARD TAFT. In two volumes. (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1914. Pp. xi, 424; 350.)

THE ardent and gifted writer of this posthumous work was a graduate of the University of Michigan of the class of 1896. He was a newspaper writer in 1900 when the opportunity came to go to the Philippines as a private secretary with the Taft Commission. He was invalided home in 1902 and later appointed American consul at Durango, Mexico. He died at Fort Bayard in 1909. Thus the space of his actual participation in Philippine affairs was brief, but the spell of the great and fascinating task which the United States had undertaken in that archipelago held him completely to the last days of his life. His service with the commission and his keen reporter's instinct for what was news promptly gave him a remarkable grasp upon the movements of Filipino thought and ambition, but this knowledge, drawn from first-hand acquaintance with the leaders of that people, was supplemented and enriched by assiduous study of Spanish colonial history and exhaustive examination of official and personal records. This is sufficiently indicated in the work under review. No other writer on the Philippines has exhibited any such wide acquaintance with both the Spanish and English sources of information upon the history of recent decades in the Philippines. The admirable foot-notes which abound disclose many sources of information, especially Spanish and native, unknown to the ordinary writer. This book, which was to be the culmination of his work in behalf of Philippine scholarship, appears some five or six years since his busy mind last reviewed it and has been prepared for press by other hands, yet its timeliness at the present moment and its permanent value to the history of the Philippines cannot be disputed. It is by far the ablest and most just account which has so far appeared upon the American possession of the Philippines. The charge of partizanship brought by one hasty reviewer cannot be maintained. Throughout the recital of the controverted matters which this work covers, the author has held the just and even balance of a thoroughly historical mind.

The work divides into two parts. The first and the briefer is a summary of Spanish achievements. In the first forty pages the old régime is reviewed in its social and economic features: the state of culture of the Filipinos before the conquest, the work of the friar-missionaries and the controversies arising from their position, the reform efforts following the English occupation of Manila made by Anda, Basco y Vargas, and Archbishop Santa Justa y Rufina, the development of foreign commerce, and the changes brought by the admission of Filipinos to contact with the outside world. This summary recalls the introduc-

tory chapter written by the late Professor Bourne for Blair and Robertson's *Philippine Islands*. With much less historic detail, its final judgments have the advantage of being written from a first-hand acquaintance, and while less complimentary to Spanish achievement, are distinctly more convincing. The two following chapters deal with the reform effort made by Spanish Liberals from 1860 onwards, the repeated check of this liberal movement, the reactionary part played by the religious orders and the development of the spirit of revolt in the people. This is an extremely important historical episode. What Spanish power in the Philippines faced between 1860 and 1896, other colonial powers must face at some time in the future. The lessons of Spain's failure need to be written very large for the instruction of the present century. Only a monumental work devoted to this period will fully satisfy historical requirements but Mr. LeRoy's chapters furnish an excellent introduction. Some criticisms however may be made. His estimate of the Filipino population of the islands at the time of the conquest is from one to two and a half millions and is certainly an overstatement. The numbers brought under the conquerors for the first hundred years scarcely rose above a half million. Outside of these the Moros and pagan wild peoples could have represented only a few hundreds of thousands at most. In his narration of social conditions under Spain the author has been much influenced by Rizal, whose novels he had thoroughly perused. His account of this remarkable man is just but he commits what was once a common error in calling him a full-blood Tagalog. The recent investigations of Mr. Austin Craig into the lineage of Rizal show him to have been nearly half Chinese, with a strain of Spanish and Ilokano inheritance as well as Tagalog. For this period the writer used also the excellent works of Mas and Jagor, the publications of Retana, the periodical, *La Política de España en Filipinas*, and personal narratives of Spanish life in the Philippines. Diligently as these have been employed, their sum is not enough to reconstruct the life of the islands previous to 1898. Only as the younger generation of Filipino students now appearing set their hands to collecting the materials for Philippine life in the pre-American period will a comprehensive and fully sympathetic knowledge be gained of what that life was.

The major portion of the work is an account of the American occupation from the battle of Manila Bay to the second election of Mr. McKinley, a period of two and a half years. As a careful consecutive narration of a brief but most important period it fills a real need. The battle of Manila Bay and the capture of Manila have been described from the military standpoint by Admiral Chadwick in his *Spanish War*, and Mr. Worcester has recently traversed the subject of early relations between Americans and Filipinos, the dictatorial government and the responsibility for hostilities, but his writing is based almost wholly on Captain Taylor's *Philippine Insurgent Records*, while Mr. LeRoy not only employed these records but also used exhaustively the American

reports and Congressional documents, the Spanish accounts, the *Defensas* of Blanco, Primo de Rivera, Montojo, and Nozaleda, the histories of the revolution by Sastrón, Father Martinez, and other Spaniards, the Filipino revolutionary papers *La Independencia* and *Heraldo de la Revolución*, and the personal experiences recounted to him by Filipinos active in the affairs of this period. Here again time will give us, let it be hoped, much more of the Filipino side, especially descriptions of what took place in provinces and towns under Filipino rule, but for the present and until the Filipino himself becomes articulate through the production of a native group of historical writers trained to some degree of impartiality, Mr. LeRoy's work embodies nearly all the information that is available to the historian. It is this that makes it indispensable to the serious student of history and of colonial government, superior to anything that has yet appeared and far above the recent works of Blount and Worcester, not only in the range of materials employed, but in judicial tone and convincing power.

Something should be said of the orthography of Filipino names employed by Mr. LeRoy. It follows in the main the reforms which the Filipinos themselves have adopted and which date from the linguistic studies of Rizal; that is, k is used in place of hard c, as "Ilokos", "Kagayan", s in place of z, a sound which does not occur in Filipino languages, "Kapis", "Samboanga", and s instead of c in such names as "Sebu". A still more important restoration is the use of b in place of v. The sound "v" does not occur in Philippine languages but owing to the confusion of b and v in Spanish orthography a most unfortunate error was made in writing such names as Bisayas, Bigan, and Bikol, "Visayas", "Vigan", and "Vicol". American authorities repeated the blunder. Some years ago a committee on geographical names was appointed in Manila, but unfortunately this committee was so little instructed in its task and so disposed to adhere to errors that had the sanction of a few years of use, that it failed to provide a proper system of orthography, or even to correct such inexcusable mistakes as the introduction of the letter v into the place-names of languages which do not contain this consonant at all. The "ow" sound in such names as Mindanao and Bolinao which is generally spelt now by Filipino writers "aw" is represented by Mr. LeRoy by the diphthong "au". In this he has the support of the nomenclature adopted in China and other parts of the East, and yet, if it is inadvisable to employ "aw" for the practical reason that it would never be pronounced by English readers in any way except to rhyme with "saw", it would seem best to retain the Spanish "ao", which has the advantage of long use and is capable of being correctly pronounced, in spite of the obstinate disposition of English-speaking peoples to invert this diphthong into "oa" as has happened in such words as "proa" and "cocoa". In a few cases Mr. LeRoy failed to carry out consistently the system of orthography which he obviously preferred. "Guagua", for instance, should have been written "Wawa", and "Igorrots" requires but a single r.

The book everywhere reveals painstaking revision for the press, but a few proof errors may be noted: "Tuguegagau" for Tugegarau (p. 9), Nerzagaray for Norzagaray (p. 125). Archbishop Pedro Payo's name is several times misspelt, "Paya". A useful bibliographical list and an index complete the second volume. There are a couple of maps which are not quite satisfactory. For the student unfamiliar with the ground, special detailed maps are indispensable in order to understand the several campaigns which are narrated. These are not supplied.

DAVID P. BARROWS.

MINOR NOTICES

Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the Year 1912. (Washington, 1914, pp. 734.) The policy of the American Historical Association in freely permitting publication, elsewhere than in its annual reports, of papers which have been read at its public sessions, occasionally bears fruit in a volume which, in respect to the part of its contents devoted to historical articles, is of much less interest than was the meeting from which it sprang. The Boston-Cambridge meeting of 1912 was a very interesting one, but, apart from the formal record of proceedings, it is represented here by but six articles, some of which are below the usual average of interest, and by seven smaller pieces, read in one or other of the various conferences, and quite brief though of distinct value. Of the latter the most useful make suggestions respecting the study of commercial history in various lines, and of slavery, and of Pennsylvania history in the middle portion of the nineteenth century. The six major papers mentioned are that of Professor Henry L. Cannon on "Royal Finances of the Reign of Henry III.", rather in advocacy of American publication of English Pipe Rolls than contributory to the substance of history; that of Mr. Henry O. Taylor on the "Antecedents of the Quattrocento", a comprehensive and large-minded survey; that of Mr. Henry P. Biggar on "The New Columbus", dealing with the results of modern research and recent discoveries, especially with Mr. Vignaud's findings; that of Dr. Clarence W. Bowen on "The Charter of Connecticut"; that of Professor Frank M. Anderson on "The Enforcement of the Alien and Sedition Laws", a thorough and informing piece of research; and Professor Carl Becker's very clever paper on "The Reviewing of Historical Books". The proceedings of the conference on military history are given at full length from a stenographic report. Those of the ninth annual conference of historical societies are accompanied by two papers, one by Mr. Charles K. Bolton of the Boston Athenaeum on "Genealogy and History", and one by Mr. Worthington C. Ford on "The Massachusetts Historical Society". The report of the Public Archives Commission is accompanied by a report of the proceedings of the fourth annual conference of

archivists and by full reports on the archives of the states of Louisiana and Montana, by Professor William O. Scroggs and Mr. Paul C. Phillips respectively. Then follows a classified list of the publications of the American Historical Association from its beginning in 1884, a guide long needed. The latter half of the volume consists of the letters of William Vans Murray to John Quincy Adams, 1797–1803 (practically 1797–1801), edited by Mr. Ford and presented as the report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission. Succeeding Adams as minister to the Netherlands in June, 1797, Murray, who was a facile and vivacious writer, immediately began a voluminous correspondence with his predecessor, who during these four years represented the United States at the Prussian court. Murray was an accomplished man, and a keen observer as well as an assiduous correspondent. His narrative of what went on in Holland and elsewhere in his part of Europe during those eventful years is extremely entertaining. His remarks are acute, and if they are not precisely weighty, it must be remembered that he was but thirty-five when his service at the Hague began. In the main the interest of the letters relates to European history; but the episode of the French mission of Pinckney, Murray, and Ellsworth is set forth with so much fullness that this will always be one of the chief sources for its history.

Cuestiones de Historia del Derecho y de Legislación Comparada. Por Rafael Altamira y Crevea, de la Real Academia de Ciencias Morales y Politicas y Catedrático de Universidad. (Madrid, Sucesores de Hernando, 1914, pp. 402.) The widespread regret over Professor Altamira's practically enforced resignation from the post of Director de Primera Enseñanza in which he was doing such notable work for the cause of Spanish education, will be tempered by the reflection that he will now find more time for writing. The volume which lies before us supplements his *Cuestiones Preliminares de Historia del Derecho Español* (1903) and consists of a series of essays on legal and institutional topics, some of which have already appeared in local periodical publications, now reunited for the first time. These essays fall into three fairly well-defined parts. First comes an admirable survey of the growth and development of Spanish law from the earliest times to our own day, together with useful discussions of the present state of our knowledge of this topic. Next comes a group of special essays on legal and institutional subjects, in which the Spanish topics are often significantly compared and contrasted with parallel developments north of the Pyrenees. Much of this part rests on original investigation and research, and adds considerably to our knowledge of the matters treated. Lastly, we have a number of summaries and syllabuses of lecture courses and seminars conducted by Señor Altamira when he was professor at the University of Oviedo from 1897 to 1910, which throw a flood of light on his method of teaching a traditionally difficult topic, and on the relative importance which he assigns to the different phases of Spanish legal and constitutional development.

It will be readily seen that this compact, convenient volume is a priceless boon to all who are specially interested in the matters with which it deals; and students of Latin America will also find much that is useful and apposite within its covers. The study of Spanish legal institutions has only recently begun to be conducted on scientific lines. In the movement which has led to this most desirable result, Professor Altamira has borne no inconsiderable part; and his wide acquaintance with conditions in other European lands, in Latin America, and in the United States gives his work a cosmopolitanism and breadth of appeal which will be deeply appreciated by all who have toiled wearily through the dreary pages of the ponderous works of the Spanish legal historians of the old school. The general survey with which the book begins will doubtless prove the most valuable part for American students, particularly because of the admirable descriptive notes on the various authorities. Spain's temporary loss of an able, patriotic, and devoted administrator promises to become the permanent gain of the world of historical scholars.

ROGER B. MERRIMAN.

Architecture and the Allied Arts: Greek, Roman, Byzantine, Romanesque, and Gothic. By Alfred M. Brooks, Professor of Fine Arts, Indiana University. (Indianapolis, The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1914, pp. 257.) The *raison d'être* of this handsome and heavy volume is not obvious. It is beautifully printed, with broad margins and admirable photographic illustrations, but it has little to say regarding either the theory or the interrelations of the arts it professes to discuss; indeed the arts allied to architecture receive but scant notice of any sort. Moreover, Oriental and Renaissance art, with all their marvellous wealth in the products of the allied arts, are not included. The book appears to be in reality the substance of an elementary course of lectures to college students on the history of ancient and medieval architecture, with occasional brief excursions into the field of the allied arts, chiefly sculpture. But, being neither wholly historical nor dominantly analytical, the arrangement of the text-matter is sometimes confusing; less so, however, than the arrangement of illustrations, which are scattered without regard either to the adjacent text or even to numerical order. Thus figure 105 is followed by 85; 106 comes many pages after 118, and so on; so that reference to the figures by number imposes much vexatious searching. Lack of technical training is suggested in some of the criticisms, and in such errors as that of allowing but two systems of construction as possible—the lintel and the arch—thus ignoring both the truss and cohesive construction, which have been of so fundamental importance in modern work. The part played by stained glass in the development of Gothic architecture is hardly alluded to. There can certainly be no excuse for the blunder of offering as the plan of the Parthenon the plan of the pseudo-dipteral temple at Selinus (fig. 9).

These errors and omissions might be overlooked if the text set forth familiar facts and principles with great originality either of thought or expression, or with striking breadth and masterly grasp of the subject, but in these the book is certainly deficient. The statements of fact are, however, generally correct, and the critical judgments do not stray from the beaten path of the standard reference books.

A. D. F. HAMLIN.

Kindred and Clan in the Middle Ages and After: a Study in the Sociology of the Teutonic Races. By Bertha Surtees Phillpotts, M.A. (Cambridge, Universtiy Press, 1913, pp. xii, 302.) "The aim of this book is to discover how long the solidarity of the kindred survived as a social factor of importance in the various Teutonic countries." To determine this Miss Phillpotts has made a study of all the various forms of action in which the kindred unit seems to have found expression. She finds that the kinsmen helped to pay and participated in the wergild, assisted as oath-helpers, had a part in reconciling enemies, helped to support indigent members of the kindred, defended rights of inheritance, and otherwise watched over the interests of the kindred group. The study covers the laws and customs of England, the Scandinavian countries, including Iceland, northwestern Germany, the Netherlands, Belgium, and northern France. The materials used are of great variety: though the author by no means neglects the laws, she believes that the narrative sources give more trustworthy evidence in the matter of living custom; and she has been able to find much information in court records, charters, and kindred documents. Miss Phillpotts reaches a number of interesting conclusions. She finds first of all that the kindred unit has not, during historic times, played the important part that was once assigned to it by students of Germanic institutions. The English and the Icelandic sources show almost no traces of kindred solidarity: the apparent importance of kinship in England in the latter part of the tenth and the earlier part of the eleventh century the author attributes to Danish influence. In Denmark and northern Germany, however, the region that Miss Phillpotts accepts as the ancient home of the Germanic peoples, the institution lived on into the modern period: in Holstein there are traces of kindred activity as late as the nineteenth century (p. 245). The author discusses the various reasons that have been advanced for the decline of the kindred and rejects them all. It is her belief that migration was the true cause, especially migration by sea. She is also inclined to stress the influence of Protestantism with its emphasis on the responsibility of the individual. Miss Phillpotts also presents some interesting conclusions on the nature of the kindred in prehistoric times and on the importance of the group of kinsmen as an anti-feudal influence. Her study throws much light, not only on the specific institution that she has traced, but also on other related subjects. As a rule the author is conservative in her generalizations, but at times

she seems able to dispose of difficult facts and puzzling evidence with surprising ease and facility. While recognizing the great value of Miss Phillpotts's work, the reviewer doubts that the final word has yet been spoken on all the phases of this intricate subject. However, on the central problem of the study, that of solidarity and survival, the author's conclusions appear to be in complete agreement with the evidence.

LAURENCE M. LARSON.

Early Wars of Wessex: being Studies from England's School of Arms in the West. By Albany F. Major. Edited by the late Charles W. Whistler, M.R.C.S. (Cambridge, University Press, 1913, pp. xvi, 238.) Some years ago Major P. T. Godsal tried to trace the lines of Saxon conquest in southern Britain "by considering the military necessities and strategy involved in such a campaign". His work, *The Storming of London*, was, however, not taken seriously by students who still believed that history should be written from documents. Recently Mr. A. F. Major has been at work on similar materials, but he has used them with greater caution and has depended more on documentary evidence. Mr. Major believes that "much of the early history of these islands remains writ large on the face of the country" and he attempts to decipher these records. He accepts the narrative of the conquest given in the *Chronicle*, and tries to confirm and eke this out by a study of topography, earthworks, camps, roads, and other evidences of military occupation and activity. The first book deals with the rise of Wessex, the gradual expansion from Hampshire westward, and the long struggle with the Welsh kingdom of Devon. Much stress is laid on this warfare: it was "the school of arms" in which the Saxons learned how to resist the Danes at a later time. The second book gives a general account of the Danish invasions, while the third is devoted to Alfred's campaigns of 876–878. Many of Mr. Major's suggestions are extremely plausible; but most of his conclusions are hypothetical or supported by evidence that can be variously read and interpreted. In the use of documentary evidence he is not always critical. He appears convinced that the Saxon Shore "on the east coast of England was already more or less colonized by Saxons when the Romans came" (p. 95). He accepts the view of recent Norse historians who believe that Scandinavians visited Britain even before the Anglo-Saxon invasions (p. 94) and that they settled the Shetland Isles about 600 (p. 97). He finds Scandinavian settlements in southwestern England a century before the date given in the *Chronicle* as of the earliest appearance of Northmen in Wessex (p. 113). Mr. Major's identification of Leofwine (p. 135) and his explanation of Pallig's defection (p. 132) are at best doubtful. He also accepts the story that Edmund Ironside was assassinated (p. 135), which is probably mythical.

LAURENCE M. LARSON.

Alfred in the Chroniclers. By Edward Conybeare, M.A. Second edition. (Cambridge, W. Heffer and Sons, 1914, pp. xi, 272.) The first edition of Mr. Conybeare's work on Alfred appeared in 1899 and was doubtless inspired by the Alfred millennium. In its present form the volume shows some revision but no changes in the plan. The larger part is made up of extracts from the more important English chronicles, such as the writings of Asser, Ethelwerd, and Simeon of Durham, and from the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*; however, the author has also included notices from writers as late as the fourteenth century, where these appear to have information not found elsewhere. These later touches to the story may, he thinks, "well be founded on some floating traditions". Among the writings represented is the spurious Crowland Chronicle, which Mr. Conybeare believes is "certainly no mere invention", though not the work of Ingulf. In an "introductory sketch" of some length, the author traces the career of the hero-king. The new edition, he assures us, "has profited by the criticism of my reviewers", but it cannot have profited much. The "sketch" is written from the point of view of the generation of Freeman and Green. Mr. Conybeare still uses such old, misleading terms as "mark" and "heptarchy". He still dates the unification of England from the overlordship of Egbert. Of the Danes in England he seems to know only what can be gathered from the English sources; of recent Scandinavian research along this line he is evidently not informed. But strangest of all, he seems not to have heard of the *Rolls Series*: in his bibliographical notes he refers to Savile's *Scriptores*, Petrie's *Monumenta*, Twysden's *Decem Scriptores* and other early editions, but never to the *Rolls Series*.

LAURENCE M. LARSON.

Germany. By A. W. Holland. [The Making of the Nations.] (London, Adam and Charles Black, 1914, pp. viii, 312.) "At the present day, especially when so much is heard about Germany and the Germans, it is surely necessary that the large reading public should be familiar with the outlines of German history", says the preface. An authentic portrait of Queen Louise as frontispiece and some thirty other good illustrations indicate further the reader whom the author has in mind. He would have been wise, therefore, if he had selected a few interesting threads for connected treatment and focused on a few of the great personalities. Instead, he chronicles multitudinous events; dates and names abound. Occasionally, when he seeks to make some explanation, as he says, "in plain English", he resorts to analogies which are not particularly illuminating, as when he compares the *Reichskammergericht* to the Hague Peace Conference, or when he says Charles VI. with his Pragmatic Sanction was like an Englishman who has various bits of land—freeholds, copyholds, leaseholds, etc.—and "wants to make them into a single estate with a single set of deeds". The mention in the last chapter of the recent marriage of William II.'s

daughter to the Guelph heir gives an appearance of up-to-dateness to the volume and of attention to modern Germany; but more pages are devoted to the period before Charlemagne than to the period since 1848. The map of Prussia's growth from 1648 to 1795 has exchanged its proper designation and place in the text with the map meant to illustrate the Peace of Westphalia. The text also is not free from inaccuracies.

S. B. F.

Henry II. By L. F. Salzmann, B.A., F.S.A. [Kings and Queens of England, edited by Robert S. Rait and William Page.] (Boston and New York, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1914, pp. 267.) The series in which this volume appears promises "a new appreciation both of the kings and of the institution of royalty". Fortunately Mr. Salzmann keeps clear of the institution of royalty, and his judgment on Henry II., while sane and sober, is not strikingly new. What he has given us is a succinct and straightforward narrative of the events of Henry's reign, with three concluding chapters on legal and constitutional matters, finance, and "the English nation under Henry II." The limits of the volume offer small space for fresh material, but the author has used the fundamental sources well and has drawn to excellent purpose upon that inexhaustible mine of information for the twelfth century, the Pipe Rolls. Irish and Welsh affairs receive due attention, but the Continental aspects of the Angevin empire get scant consideration and are treated as "foreign affairs", by a persistent anachronism which forgets that they were quite as domestic as English matters. In the brief account of social and economic conditions the author naturally shows himself at home, but the intellectual life of the reign is slighted. The style, while unpretentious, is not without point, as when Giraldus Cambrensis is called "the proto-journalist". The illustrations are from seals and contemporary illuminations. Less vivid than Mrs. Green's little volume on the same subject, Mr. Salzmann's is still not dull, and both in research and in point of view it reflects the advance of historical study in twenty-five years.

C. H. H.

The Great Roll of the Pipe for the Thirty-First Year of the Reign of King Henry the Second, A. D. 1184–1185. [Publications of the Pipe Roll Society, vol. XXXIV.] (London, St. Catherine Press, 1913, pp. xlii, 299.) Although one Pipe Roll of this period is apt to be much like another so far as the general trend of information yielded is concerned, the present is exceptional because of the great amount of space occupied with the activities of the royal justices. Here may be seen more clearly than in any previous roll how Henry's new legal and judicial machinery actually worked. Some items relating to the jury may serve to illustrate the nature of this material. A borough contributes to the royal

revenue for its failure to send a jury when summoned (p. 38). One hundred is fined for denying before the justices what it had declared in the county court (p. 161), another for concealing a plea of the crown (p. 23), and a third for placing on its jury a man not of the hundred (p. 210). A hundred-man must pay apparently for his indiscretion in putting villeins on the jury (pp. 161, 221); a record which seems to indicate that the indictment jury was selected by the bailiff of the hundred. And these are but few of the miscellaneous bits of information to be had about one institution.

Mr. Round has edited the text with his accustomed care. He also contributes in the introduction a brief survey of the contents with illuminating comments on notable aspects. It is a pleasure to note that the *index rerum* is fuller than in previous volumes, though it would be possible to include a still larger number of subjects advantageously in subsequent indexes. W. E. Lunt.

Essai sur l'Armée Royale au Temps de Philippe Auguste. Par Édouard Audouin, Professeur à la Faculté des Lettres de Poitiers. (Paris, H. Champion, 1913, pp. 234.) This is a revised, re-arranged, and much enlarged edition of the articles published by M. Audouin in *Le Moyen Âge* during 1912 and 1913. The author has again demonstrated that Philip Augustus had a standing army which, in 1202, numbered about 2700 to 2800 men, of whom about 2000 were not of the knightly class. The king was able to maintain this permanent force by taking contributions from some of his communes, cities, and abbeys, in place of the military contingent which they owed for three months' service. With the money he hired approximately one-quarter as many men for the whole year.

There are seventy-five pages of *pièces*, including (1) the Prisia Servientium, which the author has dated more accurately; (2) the fourteenth-century translation of this document; (3) a list of the military contributions furnished by the communes, cities, and abbeys in 1202; (4) eight documents showing the pay of the soldiers in various garrisons; (5) three sets of receipts and expenditures of royal officials in connection with military matters; and (6) inventories of the military supplies in some of the king's fortresses. All of these documents are admirably annotated, some unusual terms are defined and explained, the views and errors of earlier writers are discussed; the whole forms a body of material of interest to every student of the period. There is a bibliography of nearly 100 titles, and a good index. M. Audouin's articles in *Le Moyen Âge* brought out a considerable number of new points of view, and much new material; in this new edition, the value of the study is enhanced.

Comptes de la Ville d'Ypres de 1267 à 1380. Publiés par G. des Marez, Archiviste de la Ville de Bruxelles, et E. de Sagher, Archiviste de

la Ville d'Ypres. Tome II. [Académie Royale de Belgique.] (Brussels, Kiessling et Cie., 1913, pp. viii, 1042.) The present volume contains the annual accounts of the revenues received and the disbursements made by the treasurers of Ypres from 1316 to 1329. Students of local, municipal, and economic history are likely to reap the richest harvest from its pages, but the gleanings which may be obtained on numerous other aspects of medieval civilization will well repay the efforts of the patient searcher. The organization and government of the municipality, the municipal works undertaken, the rights and duties of citizenship, the equipment and wages of soldiers, and the current prices of commodities are merely illustrative of the nature and variety of the subjects on which the entries in these accounts yield information. Of special interest are the sections given to the expenses incurred by municipal messengers and diplomatic agents, which furnish many details about the relations of Ypres to neighboring cities and countries. It is also noteworthy that a popular revolution resulting in the establishment of a new government in 1325 is reflected in the documents by a change of language from French to Flemish.

W. E. Lunt.

Bartolus of Sassoferrato: his Position in the History of Medieval Political Thought. By Cecil N. Sidney Woolf, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. (Cambridge, University Press, 1913, pp. xxiv, 414.) This book contains four chapters. The first deals with the life of Bartolus, the second with what the author calls the political theories of Bartolus, the third with the problem of the Empire, and the fourth with some general conclusions. The second is subdivided into sections dealing with the theories of Bartolus on the relation of the Empire to (a) the papacy; (b) the kingdoms within it; and (c) the city states or imperial cities. The third is a general survey of the theories of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries on the subject of the imperial and papal powers and the relation of Bartolus to such theories.

The author was set to work on this special task by Dr. Figgis and received the Thirlwall Prize for it. So far as concerns any contribution to the history of political theory the work must be considered as a fruitless task. The author has to acknowledge at the start that Bartolus was not a political thinker, but a lawyer, and to this acknowledgment he refers again and again in the pages of the book. The student of political theory must fail to see the *raison d'être* of the book.

For nearly one hundred pages the reader proceeds through long and sometimes pointless Latin quotations from the works of Bartolus, and yet all of the political ideas of the great jurist can be given on pages 99 and 100. By seizing upon *disjecta membra* in the works of Bartolus Mr. Woolf has got together some theories on the Empire and the papacy, but it is doubtful if Bartolus would recognize them as his own. The author has to acknowledge that Bartolus was a coward (pp. 86, 94) and

was afraid to say what he thought—that he reversed himself for fear of giving offense. A difference of opinion with Dr. Figgis is dragged in on pages 101–107 but it is difficult to see what it has to do with Bartolus.

On page 100 the author says that he hopes to show Bartolus occupying a high place in the history of political thought, but on page 211 he leaves us with this dilemma: "either that Bartolus was quite out of touch with the contemporary thought of his time, or that as a political thinker, he is negligible". Whichever way we choose we do not get a flattering view of Bartolus. After finishing the third chapter, which is almost entirely devoted to authors other than Bartolus, we are tempted to ask: "What political theories did Bartolus have at all to entitle him to the special treatment given in the title of the book?"

As a study showing that Mr. Woolf is capable of doing the highest kind of scholarly work this volume is ample proof, but we may reasonably doubt the wisdom of putting such works into print. Many special studies are undertaken by students in all parts of the world, of which, when they are finished, it must be acknowledged that they have been productive of no results, except to show that the student is capable of a high grade of work; but why put them into print?

JAMES SULLIVAN.

Collectanea Franciscana. Edited by A. G. Little, M. R. James, and H. M. Bannister. [British Society of Franciscan Studies, vol. V.] (Aberdeen, University Press, 1914, pp. vii, 163.) This the fifth volume issued under the auspices of the British Society of Franciscan Studies is the fruit of a happy collaboration. It opens with a study (pp. 7–8) of "Brother William of England, Companion of St. Francis", by A. G. Little, M.A., in connection with which four early Franciscan drawings of great interest are reproduced from the Matthew Paris manuscripts. We are also indebted to Mr. Little for a detailed description (pp. 9–13) of a Franciscan manuscript formerly in the Phillipps Library which dates from about 1400 and which contains the Latin version of all the six chapters of the *Fioretti* that Sabatier was unable to find in any manuscript of the *Actus Beati Francisci* when he published his critical edition of the latter work in 1902. Mr. Little further prints (pp. 141–153), from the Cotton Charter in the British Museum, some lists of friars of the English Franciscan Province, who died early in the fourteenth century. These lists, which are preceded by a brief introduction, are the only original records of the English provincial chapters yet discovered. In addition to Mr. Little's contributions, the present volume includes an account (pp. 114–123) of "The Library of the Grey Friars of Hereford", by M. R. James, Litt.D., F.B.A., vice-chancellor of the University of Cambridge, and a short notice by the Rev. H. M. Bannister, M.A. (pp. 124–140), of "Some Manuscripts of the Cambridge Friars now in the Vatican Library". Every student of Franciscan history must be grateful to Messrs. Little, James, and Bannister for their joint labor in the prep-

aration of this first installment of the *Collectanea Franciscana*, which is highly creditable both to themselves and to the society under whose auspices it is published. The very full index (pp. 156–163) contributes not a little to the practical utility of the work. And praise is due to its admirable production by the Aberdeen University Press.

PASCHAL ROBINSON.

Chronica Johannis de Reading et Anonymi Cantuariensis, 1346–1367. Edited with Introduction and Notes by James Tait, M.A., Professor of Ancient and Medieval History, University of Manchester. [Publications of the University of Manchester, Historical Series, no. XX.] (Manchester, University Press, 1914, pp. xi, 394.) The appearance of these two short fourteenth-century chronicles under the able editorship of Professor Tait is an event of some importance for English medieval historiography. A quite substantial preface, a valuable scholarly introduction of historical, biographical, and critical character, covering, with two appendixes, almost one hundred pages, and then 150 pages of full and careful notes, provide almost more than a sufficiency of comment for little over one hundred pages of text. The first and longest of the two texts has been known and used in manuscript for half a century and seems to have been the source of information and model for portions of other better known chronicles such as Higden's *Polychronicon*, Walsingham's *Historia Anglicana*, the continuation of Murimuth's *Chronicle*, and a large part of the English *Brut* having to do with the third quarter of the fourteenth century. It was probably compiled at Westminster by a somewhat humble and obscure monk named John of Reading. The other text is that of a short and comparatively unimportant chronicle of unknown authorship compiled at Canterbury. Both chronicles cover the history of the years between 1346 and 1367 and have much to say about the Hundred Years' War and the activities of the Black Prince in Spain.

The special student of English history will find much of real interest and profit in Professor Tait's introduction and notes. The former is a model of good and scholarly organization and the treatment of the value and importance of the Westminster chronicle is particularly valuable from historical, critical, and bibliographical viewpoints. Useful synopses, summaries, facsimiles, and foot-notes are furnished in connection with both chronicles. In certain instances, however, the work of editing and note-making appears to have been done hastily or carelessly. Twenty separate items fill a page of "Addenda et Corrigenda", while an examination of the text and notes reveals occasional errors and slips that have been overlooked in reading the proof. Such minor defects do not seriously detract from the value of the publication as a contribution to our knowledge of fourteenth-century history and historiography. John of Reading's *Chronicon*, in particular, throws valuable light on domestic and foreign affairs between 1359 and 1367, especially in

connection with London and Westminster, and with the Black Prince's undertakings in Spain and their influence upon England's relations with France and Scotland. The anonymous Canterbury chronicle has some value and importance as a brief independent treatment of the twenty years between 1348 and 1367.

The volume appears to have a very complete and satisfactory index, while in presswork and binding it maintains the high standard of the University of Manchester publications, which now are so numerous and well known. N. M. TRENHOLME.

Pageant of the Birth, Life, and Death of Richard Beauchamp, Earl of Warkick, K. C., 1389–1439. Edited by Viscount Dillon, D.C.L., F.S.A., and W. H. St. John Hope, Litt.D., D.C.L. Photo-engraved from the original manuscript in the British Museum by Emery Walker, F.S.A. (London, Longmans, Green, and Company, 1914, pp. x, 109.) The word "pageant" had a variety of meanings in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries in England. It was used for the movable or wheeled platform of the show, for the show or pageant proper, and for the pictures or illustrations of some great event or notable career. It is, of course, in the third meaning that it is used here, for this handsome small quarto volume contains a well-edited series of late fifteenth-century drawings, with appropriate mottoes, illustrating in an interesting and graphic way the career of Richard Beauchamp, earl of Warwick, 1389–1439. This nobleman was very famous in the fifteenth century as a courtier, a knight, and a soldier, though he is chiefly remembered now as the father-in-law of Richard Neville, earl of Warwick, the "King Maker", his successor. These plates show how he was born, baptized, knighted, and how he acquitted himself in life. There are fifty-three well-executed historical drawings but the name of the artist is unknown. He had considerable ability in depicting military and religious scenes and, if not a foreigner, had probably been trained abroad as he shows Renaissance characteristics.

The drawings were first reproduced, in a somewhat crude and imperfect manner, in Strutt's *Horda Angel-Cynnan* (1775). Another set of reproductions was prepared a century later for the Roxburghe Club with an introduction by Sir E. Maunde Thompson, but it was limited and expensive. The present work is, therefore, the first adequate and popular presentation of the drawings and mottoes. The editors have done their work well and modestly and the volume will prove of value as an illustration of fifteenth-century life, customs, armor, and costumes, besides furnishing an interesting biography of the central figure of the Warwick pageant. N. M. T.

Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman depuis les Origines jusqu'à nos Jours. Par le Vicomte de la Jonquière. Nouvelle édition entièrement refondue et complétée. In two volumes. [Histoire Universelle publiée par une Société de Professeurs et de Savants sous la Direction de M. V. Duruy.]

(Paris, Hachette et Cie., 1914, pp. 472; 732.) After a third of a century (the "deuxième édition" of 1897 was a reprint) this book has been revised and continued by its author. The part revised hardly deserves the appellation "une œuvre nouvelle". While countless minor stylistic changes have been made, often to little advantage, there has been no thorough reworking of the material. Additions have been made, as in regard to legends of early Turkish times (I. 38 ff.), the influence of the Byzantine Empire upon the Turkish (I. 60, 71, 101), the story of early Montenegro (II. 3 ff.), and the nineteenth-century insurrections in Crete (II. 30 ff.). But a number of inadequacies and errors remain, many of which might have been corrected by using the German works of Zinkeisen and Jorga. In particular, the political organization of the great days might have been better developed to correspond with the full treatment, after D'Ohsson, of the judicial organization (I. 118–127, 196–201). The author reveals some change of views in the directions of less sympathy with Mohammedanism, severer strictures upon Greek Orthodox "schismatics", and more devotion to Roman Catholicism. But in both religious and political matters he is remarkably impartial. The French public possesses, in the older portion of the book alone, a more adequate history of Turkey than exists in English.

The added portions, nearly equal to the original work, give a certain disproportion to the book. Eighty-nine pages carry the story from 1878 to 1908, 274 pages deal with the events of the past six years, and 264 pages, of which two-thirds is new, survey present conditions, geographical, racial, and religious, political, military, and economic. The disproportion is not regrettable. Whereas the first edition was mostly third-hand, the new material, from observation and verification during the author's thirty years' residence in Constantinople, is practically first-hand. The narrative, which is mainly political, is careful and accurate, and interspersed with valuable discussions and opinions. The account of the military operations of 1913–1914 is disappointingly brief and bald. The only serious mistake observed is in the assertion that the British government has spent much money to support Protestant missionary work among the Armenians (II. 492), and the neglect to mention the work of the American missionary colleges, whereas the parallel work of the French missionary schools is given place (pp. 567, 568). The last chapter discusses in sound and reserved fashion the future of Turkey. While accepting the constitutional régime as permanent, the author feels less hope than formerly that Turkey, bound by its *Sheri* or Sacred Law and its administrative tradition, can give equal treatment to Christian or even to non-Turkish Moslem citizens.

The bibliography has been nearly doubled (now 14 pp.), mainly by the addition of books on the period since 1878. The titles are nearly all French, with a few in Latin, Italian, and English; German is represented by a few French translations. There is no index, and the geographical list of the first edition is omitted. Of the six maps in black and white,

three are new, showing present political and ethnographical conditions in the Balkan Peninsula, and the existing and projected railways of Asiatic Turkey.

ALBERT HOWE LYBYER.

Commentaires de Blaise de Monluc, Maréchal de France. Édition critique publiée et annotée par Paul Courteault, Professeur à la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Bordeaux. Tome II., 1553–1563. [Collection de Textes pour servir à l'Étude et à l'Enseignement de l'Histoire.] (Paris, Auguste Picard, 1914, pp. 587.) The present volume of M. Courteault's definitive edition of the *Commentaires* of Blaise de Monluc maintains in all respects the extremely high standard set by its predecessor (which, by the way, was erroneously entitled "volume II." in the notice which appeared on p. 654 of vol. XVII. of this journal), and by the editor's earlier biography of Monluc and critical estimate of his historical work (*cf.* AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, XIV. 119, 848).

The events here described are of course chiefly military, and occurred, part of them during the last phase of the Hapsburg-Valois conflict, and the rest during the opening years of the French Civil Wars. By all odds the most interesting and brilliant of them and the one which added most to Monluc's reputation was his defense of Siena against the Imperialists under the Marquis of Marignano from July, 1554, to April, 1555. His selection for this difficult task was due to the fact that Piero Strozzi, who commanded the Siennese forces, desired to wage war in the open country and needed an ally to hold the city. Apparently the king had a good many doubts about giving the job to Monluc, for fear that his Gascon temper and rough manners would embroil him with the Siennese: and a couple of precious pages of self-revelation, and of aggrieved vindication of the qualities of impatience and irascibility in general, found their way into the *Commentaires* as a result of the royal hesitations. Despite severe illness, and constant difficulties with the undisciplined Siennese, Monluc acquitted himself with great credit, and if Strozzi had been able to avoid defeat outside, might well have maintained his position, and forced the Imperialists to raise the siege. As it was, he successfully repulsed a number of assaults, and finally forced his adversary to resort to tactics of starvation. The account of the miseries suffered by the besieged during the last months before the capitulation is highly realistic; and Monluc's self-laudation is so naïve, consistent, and undisguised that it is totally unnecessary to warn the reader to make allowances for it. "Le nom de Monluc ne se trouvera jamais en capitulation", so he boldly assured the Imperialist envoys on the morning of the very day when terms of surrender were actually agreed upon, and the garrison permitted to march out with all the honors of war.

One more volume ought to carry this admirable work to its close in 1575. A full and detailed index will be indispensable to absolute com-

pleteness, and if M. Courteault will but follow the admirable example which he has set himself in *Blaise de Monluc, Historien*, we shall have one.

ROGER B. MERRIMAN.

The Puritans in Power: a Study in the History of the English Church from 1640 to 1660. By G. B. Tatham, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. (Cambridge, University Press, 1913, pp. vi, 282.) One of the curious though perhaps natural results of the appearance of a comprehensive history of any given period is that, so far from discouraging research, it seems to stimulate the production of monographs on some phase or detail of the events described in the more general account. There can be no doubt that Professor Gardiner's influence, quite apart from the attacks of his critics, has influenced many others to reinvestigate many of the problems which he undertook to solve. From the appearance of Mr. Inderwick's admirable study of the Interregnum to the present work the path of the student of the Puritan Revolution is strewn with similar essays. It would not seem at first sight that Stoughton's history of the Church under the Commonwealth would have left much room even for so detailed a study of something of the same subject as the book now put forth by Mr. Tatham under the rather general title which he has adopted. His work is, indeed, an account of the Puritans in power, but with the large limitation of being confined virtually to their religious, or rather their ecclesiastical, activities, and, within this category still, such as were related chiefly, not so much to their experiments in church government as to their treatment of the Establishment. The parochial clergy, sequestration committee activities, church property, the ejected clergy, the treatment of the universities, and the question of so-called "religious freedom"—virtually the persistence of Anglican services—these form the chapters. Of religious thought, of dissenters generally, as of constructive Puritanism, there is little to be found in these pages. Virtually it is the "immediate and material" results here chronicled, rather than the wide survey which the title seems to promise.

To illustrate these the author has brought together a very considerable amount of rather minute evidence drawn from a variety of sources, published and unpublished—though chiefly the former—from which he has drawn conclusions on the whole neither remarkably new nor striking. In one particular, however, they are valuable, for, generally speaking, they strengthen the position and contentions of Professor Gardiner, and they amplify the basis of our judgment. Some of them are of much interest. On the whole Mr. Tatham makes a good case for the Puritans in the universities; agrees, virtually, with Evelyn that the Church of England was "reduced to a chamber and a conventicle"; and provides an interesting discussion of that vexed question of the number of ejections, concluding that it is practically insoluble. Not the least interest-

ing part of his study is a determination of the old controversy between Macaulay and his critics regarding the status of the English clergy in the seventeenth century, in which he inclines to side with the great historian. In such matters, rather than in the broader and deeper questions inevitably raised in reading such a book, his work seems particularly valuable.

W. C. Abbott.

The Old Scots Navy, from 1689 to 1710. Edited by James Grant, LL.B. [Publications of the Navy Records Society, vol. XLIV.] (London, printed for the Navy Records Society, 1914, pp. lix, 448.) Under the auspices of the Navy Records Society, Mr. Grant has brought out a volume which helps to elucidate a hitherto very obscure period of Scottish naval history. The book is primarily a collection of papers relating to the Scottish navy between the years of 1689 and 1707, and Mr. Grant has succeeded in the difficult task of giving coherence to what would otherwise be a confused mass of materials, by grouping the documents in chapters, each of which presents a complete episode or complete phase of the subject. The part played by the Scots frigates the *Pelican* and the *Janet* in the stirring events of 1689, the siege of the Bass Rock, the Darien expedition, the absorption of the Scots navy at the Union, and the history of the office of Lord High Admiral form the central subjects of the more important chapters and receive fresh elucidation from the sources which Mr. Grant has brought together.

The brief summaries which head the separate collections make the documents considerably more accessible to the ordinary reader, but the latter will naturally find his interest centre in the "general introduction", in which Mr. Grant has given a short but scholarly outline of the history of the Scottish navy prior to 1689.

The main influences, internal and external, which fostered naval development in Scotland are sufficiently indicated. Scotland, a country of scattered islands and indented coasts, whose mountainous western shores were barely accessible by land, could never have been consolidated without naval force. The early reigns of the Alexanders and the later reigns of James IV. and James V. supply illustrative detail of the fact that sea-power was the one method by which the turbulent and semi-independent chiefs of the West could be brought into submission to the crown.

From without came a driving force no less compelling. Scotland with its long coast-line was particularly exposed to attack from the fleets of her enemies. In early times the strength of the Northmen at sea, and in later the increasing development of the English navy, compelled Scotland in self-defense to look to her naval resources, and we have the phase of enthusiasm which reached its highest point in the eager activities of James IV.

The union of the crowns, as Mr. Grant has pointed out, was at once

a check and a stimulus to the Scottish navy. The chief foe on the Scottish horizon had vanished, but the exigencies of English foreign policy exposed the scanty fleets of Scots merchantmen to new dangers on the high seas, and a navy was more than ever necessary for their protection. In actual fact, however, the Scots navy was already declining into insignificance prior to its ultimate absorption with the stronger force. The introduction closes with a sketch of the history of the Admiral's office, and the development of his powers, especially upon the jurisdictionary side.

Although the book is one which is somewhat technical in subject and also, perhaps necessarily, in treatment, it will have considerable interest for all students of naval annals, and, to those who are anxious to pursue the subject further, the excellent table of reference to the documentary sources should prove of great value.

A History of Emigration from the United Kingdom to North America, 1763–1912. By Stanley C. Johnson, M.A. [Studies in Economics and Political Science, edited by W. Pember Reeves, no. 34.] (London, George Routledge and Sons; New York, E. P. Dutton and Company, 1914, pp. xvi, 387.) This painstaking and scholarly doctor's dissertation is an account of the flow of population from the British Isles to the United States and Canada for the last 150 years. It is dense with facts, buttressed with statistics and clinched with citations from a great number of documents. All sides of the subject are gone into and, besides a review of the Causes of Emigration which touches on the chief currents in the industrial history of the United Kingdom since 1763, we have chapters on Assisted Emigration, the Transport of Emigrants, Restrictions on Immigration, the Reception of Immigrants, the Destination of Immigrants, Land Systems affecting Immigrants, Colonization Schemes, the Emigration of Women, the Emigration of Children, and the Economic and Social Value of Emigration and Immigration. The chapter on Transport paints a dark picture of fraud and exploitation. The struggle to subject the oversea carriage of emigrants to government regulation and inspection bore a singularly close resemblance to our contemporary struggle for industrial legislation. The history of the emigration of women and children is a cheering record of the diffusion of the spirit of humanity and the steady growth of a sense of collective responsibility. The author's industry has rescued from oblivion precious social experiences we ought not to forget.

Dr. Johnson presents with much force the present conflict of interest between England and her colonies respecting migration. England, sparse in country and congested in city, wants outlet for her superfluous, town-bred population. The colonies want the country-bred British who can take up homesteads, and set up such stringent requirements for admission that the town-bred migrants from the homeland can hardly pass muster. He feels that these requirements select the wheat and leave the human chaff to remain with the mother-country.

In his comments on the situation in the United States the author sometimes stumbles. He does not know that since 1906 this country has had a uniform rule of naturalization. He offers the proportion of prisoners and paupers among immigrants and natives as an index to comparative criminality and pauperism, without taking into consideration the difference in the age composition of the two groups. In reviewing the social effects of immigration he overlooks the spirit of the emigrant, the effect upon the rate of increase of the native population, and the broad contrast in social psychology between the resulting heterogeneous people and an old people.

EDWARD ALSWORTH ROSS.

Paris pendant la Terreur. Rapports des Agents Secrets du Ministre de l'Intérieur, publiés pour la Société d'Histoire Contemporaine par Pierre Caron. Tome II., 6 Nivôse an II.—27 Nivôse an II. (Paris, Alphonse Picard et Fils, 1914, pp. 404.) These reports, as stated in a notice of the first volume (AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, XVII. 184–185), belong to a series begun in August, 1793, and continued until April, 1794. Apparently the series for Nivôse is relatively complete, for the present volume covers less than a month, while its predecessor covered four months. A few reports, or parts of reports, by the "observers" Grivel and Siret were published seven years ago by M. Caron in one of the *Bulletins de la Commission de l'Histoire Économique de la Révolution*, and are not reprinted in this volume. Although the observers, who made almost daily reports, numbered fourteen or fifteen, the body of public opinion from which they quote or upon which they comment seems restricted to what may be described as *sans-culotte*. Other types of opinion would, indeed, be unlikely to be much in evidence in January, 1794. The observers, however, are on the lookout for counter-revolutionaries, conspirators, and persons without obvious reasons for being in Paris. They keep a close watch upon theatres and often complain of the *incivique* character of the plays. For example, one of them reports a play called *Les Contre-Révolutionnaires*, in which the counter-revolutionaries brought on the stage are "des êtres chimériques, et qui n'existent plus depuis longtemps; ils sont d'ailleurs si maladroits qu'ils excitent encore plus de pitié que de ressentiment, plus de mépris que d'horreur. Le personnage qui, pour les surprendre, se déguise en ambassadeur espagnol, est un mauvais plaisant, qui joue ce rôle plus en bouffon qu'en patriote." He adds that the piece is full of malevolent thrusts, which were enthusiastically applauded, and says Paris should have only three theatres, the Opéra, the Théâtre-Français, and the Théâtre-Italien. The tone of the reports is on the whole moderate, although one of the observers quotes with apparent approval a savage reference to the Dauphin and Madame Royale as *les deux louveteaux*. But another mentions the horror excited by the news of the *noyades* at Nantes which were described as "patriotic baptisms".

As the reports were to be stopped in April on account of their alleged Dantonist sentiments, it is interesting to note the attitude of the observers in the controversy which raged throughout Nivôse over the publication of the early numbers of the *Vieux Cordelier* by Danton's friend Camille Desmoulins. The observers seem to limit themselves to descriptions of the effect produced upon the minds of the people. They occasionally explain that the people deplore the bitterness of the controversy between Desmoulins and Hébert and declare that the Committee of Public Safety should intervene. No markedly Dantonist opinions are revealed, not even apropos of the arrest of Fabre d'Eglantine.

Among the illuminating facts recorded in these reports are the high prices and the danger of the complete failure of certain supplies, like meat. Current opinion, of course, attributed the evil to the machinations of the butchers or the wholesalers. There is interesting evidence also of the widespread desire to reopen the churches in spite of the anti-religious policy of the government.

H. E. Bourne.

Figures du Passé: Danton. Par Louis Madelin. (Paris, Hachette, 1914, pp. 324.) The Danton whom M. Madelin portrays is not a pale political abstraction. His tumultuous joy in combat, his devotion to his friends, his delight in a *foyer confortable,* his love of the soil, especially of his acres at his native Arcis, make him intensely alive. Moreover, M. Madelin studies him as a biographer, not as a hostile critic nor as a eulogist. This is what readers of his *Fouché* had reason to expect. In a few instances, however, his interpretations of Danton's conduct are not fully satisfying. This is true of the period from March, 1792, to August 10. In March Danton's name was mentioned for the "patriot" ministry. His check on this occasion, the author believes, threw him into violent antagonism to the court. But Danton's outbursts were so furious that one is forced to conclude that the controversies over the war with Austria and suspicions of the royal policy furnish part of the reasons. A similar question might be raised apropos of Danton's rôle in the old Cordelier district in 1789, although in this case one must confess that it is hard to discover any motive more lofty than demagogic jealousy or the irresistible impulse to assert himself.

The question of Danton's venality seems to haunt and puzzle the author all the way through. He remarks: "Rien qui paraisse plus contraire aux qualités et même aux défauts de Danton que cette misérable chose, dont certains de nos lecteurs estimeront peut-être que la preuve est faite. Il n'a pas les traits d'un vulgaire fripon." Nevertheless, M. Madelin appears to think that M. Mathiez has made out a case against Danton. His view, accordingly—to pass over the question of money accepted from the court—is that when Danton had the disposition of large funds, "La main ne se refermait pas: il y tombait de l'or, il en coulait presque autant. Parfois il lui en restait. . . . Quand il lui en

restait, il se payait probablement de la facile excuse qu'il s'était donné bien du mal, sans gagner beaucoup, à faire avancer la Révolution et comme il aimait la terre, il achetait la terre, l'imprudent!"

The account of the *Vieux Cordelier* incidents and of Robespierre's relation to this journal is open to criticism. In the first place the famous exclamation beginning "Open the prisons" belongs to No. 4, with which Robespierre apparently had nothing to do. Moreover, it is commonly believed that Robespierre looked over the proofs of No. 2 because he wanted to employ the witty journalist's pen in continuing the attack on the Hébertists which he had himself begun at the Jacobin Club. Not until Desmoulins wrote No. 3, containing his analogies from Tacitus, did Robespierre think he was going too far.

H. E. Bourne.

The Passing of the Great Reform Bill. By J. R. M. Butler, Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. (London, New York, Bombay, Calcutta, and Madras, Longmans, Green, and Company, 1914. pp. xiii, 454.) This monograph was prepared originally in 1912 as a dissertation for a fellowship in Trinity College, Cambridge. Mr. Butler would appear to have selected his subject during the excitement evoked by the Parliament Act of 1911. At least, without being misled by a false parallel between the two constitutional changes, he has strengthened his narrative of the events of 1830–1832, by viewing them with an interest derived from the contest of three years ago. He chooses for emphasis what he terms aptly the "driving force" of reform—the organized disorder which impelled the Whigs to adopt the bill, at the same time providing them with an irresistible pressure to carry it through. The biographies and memoirs upon which the study is based are all generally familiar; they have been used in conjunction with such material as the Place manuscripts and the Home Office Papers to frame an account of the Reform Bill much more definitive than the inadequate one by Molesworth. The narrative is very well done; but even better than the narrative itself is the skill shown in tracing the influence of public agitation upon the passing of the bill. Where a less discriminating writer would make this influence causal, Mr. Butler quite rightly sees it only in the light of an accompanying phenomenon.

The monograph would be more acceptable had it contained nothing but the narrative connected with the passing of the bill. Unfortunately, Mr. Butler, exceeding the immediate subject of his research, commences with chapters on reform before 1830. The chapters are superfluous as a preface; moreover, their language creates an initial prejudice against the book. Few readers will feel confidence in an historical essay which begins by describing the rule of George III., without qualification, as a *tyranny*. Even in a young disciple of the Macaulay-Trevelyan school, this remains an amazing indiscretion; but it is surpassed by a reference later to George IV. as the *hated* king. A further chapter (VI.), entitled

Opinions and Ideas, or what Mr. Butler elsewhere speaks of as the "psychological issues" of the reform struggle, also stands apart from the narrative. Like the opening chapters, it bears traces of being put together hastily, without sufficient bibliographical foundation, and with no very thorough comprehension of the questions involved. The same immaturity marks the opinions pronounced here and there upon the political conduct of Grey and of Wellington—patronizing criticisms, ill becoming the abundant inexperience of a collegian. The English political historians, now held up as models by certain sections of the English university history schools, did enjoy the prerogative of sitting in judgment; a due sense of proportion should keep them in this one respect above the common reach of academic imitation.

These imperfections of detail are indeed regrettable, because they mar an otherwise excellent book. Mr. Butler's work is not only valuable as a history of the First Reform Bill; in the opinion of the reviewer, it would form a most useful introduction to the study of the early Victorian era.

C. E. Fryer.

Cavour, and the Making of Modern Italy, 1810–1861. By Pietro Orsi, of the University of Padua, Deputy in the Italian Parliament. [Heroes of the Nations Series.] (New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1914, pp. xix, 385.) This is a summary of the history of the Risorgimento from the fall of Napoleon I., in 1815, to the fall of Napoleon III. and the completion of Italian unity, in 1870. Some dozen years ago Count Orsi published an earlier volume in which he described the conditions of Italy during the last half of the eighteenth century and the first half of the nineteenth. Now, by making Cavour the central figure in the drama, he is able to give coherence to his account of the actual creation of Italy as a nation.

Count Orsi possesses unusual skill in condensation, and joined with this skill is a well-developed sense of perspective. A third quality which he possesses in no small measure is fairness. When we add that he has adequate knowledge of his subject, it will readily be seen why he has produced so good a compendium. He is, in a word, a safe chronicler. The novice in Risorgimento history may well begin with this book; and students of wider information may turn to it for a succinct statement of the important episodes.

In his effort to be fair Count Orsi seldom passes judgments that would wound the prejudices of the survivors or descendants of the partizans of the Risorgimento. Exception is made, of course, of the Austrians and Bourbons, and in part of the Papalists, whose iniquities and corruption are more than hinted at. But the great clash of personalities and the irreconcilable ideals and methods of Cavour, Mazzini, and Garibaldi—not to mention a score of secondary but important leaders—are dealt with very gently. In a popular summary, written with the

avowed purpose of making Italians to-day feel that their fathers who created Italy were all brothers, this method has obvious advantages. In any detailed history, however, it would not do; for the interaction of personal antipathies is as important a fact among political heads as is the conflict of tactics among soldiers.

On the other hand, Count Orsi manages to outline a good many portraits, and by a liberal quotation from speeches or letters he adds to the authoritativeness of his sketch. "Safe", "informed", and "urbane" are the epithets that fit it. The translation is generally well done. On page 260, however (l. 4 from bottom) "preventive" should be previous, and "intimation" (p. 262, last line) should be notice.

The Beginnings of Colonial Maine, 1602–1658. By Henry S. Burrage, D.D., State Historian. (The State, 1914, pp. xv, 412.) The period of "beginnings" to which Dr. Burrage confines himself extends to 1658, when Massachusetts acquired jurisdiction over the last of the Maine settlements. To the sources for the period, diligently collected in recent years by Mr. J. P. Baxter and others, the author has been able to make only comparatively unimportant additions, the most notable being the Cleeve petition of 1643, which he prints for the first time (pp. 328, 329). He has, however, pursued his investigations independently both in this country and in England, and in a number of points has corrected the mistakes or supplied the omissions of earlier writers. Such traditional opinions, for example, as that Monhegan Island was the site on which Waymouth erected a cross in 1607 (pp. 69–71), or that Pemaquid was the site of a settlement prior to the arrival of the Popham colony (p. 84), or that a part of the Popham company remained in America and removed to Pemaquid or Monhegan (p. 118), ought to be effectually dissipated by Dr. Burrage's clear presentation of the facts. A needful correction is also made of Parkman, and of the English translator of Father Biard's narrative in Thwaites's *Jesuit Relations*, as to the location of the Jesuit colony on Mount Desert.

For the rest, Dr. Burrage has given us a scholarly and readable summary of the beginnings of settlement in Maine. The numerous and sometimes conflicting grants which gradually covered the region are painstakingly examined and their complicated history traced. Chapters VII., and XV., on the French settlements at Mount Desert and Castine respectively, are especially informing. Not much of novelty could be expected in an account of Sir Ferdinando Gorges or Trelawney after Mr. Baxter's exhaustive treatment of both subjects, but Dr. Burrage's narrative is clear and well proportioned, and takes account of such new material as has appeared since Mr. Baxter wrote. Another useful chapter traces the career of Robert Jordan in relation to John Winter and the Trelawney claimants. Upwards of twenty-five illustrations add to the value of the book.

Save for the activities of the Gorges family and the acquisition of

the region by Massachusetts, the history of Maine has undoubtedly been somewhat neglected by the writers of comprehensive histories. Dr. Burrage finds the explanation of the slow growth and comparative unimportance of the Maine settlements in the fact that the great political and religious controversies which characterize the history of England in the early seventeenth century found the people of Maine on the wrong side. There were Puritans in Maine, but the greater part of the proprietors and settlers were Episcopalians, and trade rather than religion furnished the chief colonizing motive. In the controversies with the crown, accordingly, Maine was predominantly royalist. The explanation is interesting but hardly sufficient. Virginia was largely Episcopalian and royalist during the same period; yet Virginia was a prosperous colony by the time of the Civil Wars. Is it not true that soil, climate, proximity to the French, and the aggressive predominance of Massachusetts were contributing causes quite as important as episcopacy and royalism?

WILLIAM MACDONALD.

Maps of Providence, R. I., 1650, 1765, 1770. By Henry R. Chace. (Providence, the compiler, 1914, pp. viii, and 6 plates.)

Owners and Occupants of the Lots, Houses, and Shops in the Town of Providence, Rhode Island, in 1798, located on Maps of the Highways of that Date; also Owners or Occupants of Houses in the Compact Part of Providence in 1759, showing the Location and in whose Names they are to be found on the Map of 1798. Compiled by Henry R. Chace. (Providence, the compiler, 1914, pp. 28, and 18 plates.) These two thin quarto atlases of neatly executed maps are the fruit of much antiquarian enthusiasm and of much minute research in the old deeds, wills, and other records of the town of Providence, and among the manuscripts preserved by the Rhode Island Historical Society. In the first atlas, the map of 1650 shows the location of the thirty-nine householders indicated by the tax list of that date. The second map shows the highways of the town in 1765. The remaining four, taken together, show the owners or occupants of houses, and their holdings, in what the Fire Act of 1759 defined as "The Compact Part of the Town of Providence". Careful indexes of names follow the maps. The second atlas is constructed mainly by the use of the original returns compiled by the commissioners for the direct tax of 1798. These schedules, preserved in the library of the Rhode Island Historical Society, show the situation, dimensions, and materials of all houses, and the names of their owners and occupants. From these materials, and the town records, Mr. Chace has with great patience constructed a real-estate map of the town as it was in 1798, presented in eighteen sectional plates, and accompanied by an elaborate and ingenious index which conveys much information as to holdings, owners, and occupants. Mr. Chace explains in a modest preface that "the amateur who did this work for his own diversion did not at the

time anticipate public examination of the maps". But the service he has performed for local history is a very substantial one, and his example is well worthy of imitation in all our older cities.

Records and Files of the Quarterly Courts of Essex County, Massachusetts. Volume III., 1662–1667. [Edited by George Francis Dow.] (Salem, Essex Institute, 1913, pp. 534.) Mr. Dow's third volume is constructed on the same plan as its predecessors (*supra*, XVIII. 631), the records of the court being printed *seriatim* and in full on the upper parts of the pages, while below are extracts of all that is most significant in the files, illustrative of the cases or of the social life of Essex in the years covered. For other than local and genealogical readers (for the latter the volume is of course full of information), it is this last-mentioned aspect in which it will have its greatest value. A remarkable index, including both names and subjects, facilitates such use of the book, by its multitude of classified entries under such topics as animals, books, clothing, crimes, food, furnishings, and utensils. It is natural to turn first to items under witchcraft. There is very little of the matter, less than one would expect of any given county in any five years of the seventeenth century. Court records, records for the most part of evil-doing and contention, can never show the whole nor the best of the life of a community; but, within its own field, we may say that if ever a volume lifted the roofs from multitudes of seventeenth-century houses and showed us fully what was going on within, this volume does so. Its workmanship shows every evidence of admirable care. The reviewer cannot think it is well to refrain from expanding the various symbols of abbreviation for per-, pre-, and pro-; many a reader will not know that "piury" means perjury, and "puidence" providence.

Records of the Columbia Historical Society. Volume XVII. *Washington Letters.* (Washington, the Society, 1914, pp. 258.) The publishing committee of the Columbia Historical Society has conceived the excellent project of printing in a separate volume all those extant letters of President Washington which relate to the laying-out and organization of the Federal District and the erection thereon of the Federal City, as he was always careful to call it. The present volume is the fruit of this undertaking. The letters, very few of which have been printed before, are derived from the letter-books of Washington in the Library of Congress, from a collection in the office of the Superintendent of Buildings and Grounds, and from a few other sources. They illustrate in a very interesting manner the history of the beginnings of the city of Washington, but would do this more completely if they were better supplied with annotations, for lack of which persons unfamiliar with the real history of Washington (that is, nearly all readers) will fail to obtain from the book the full significance of its story. But as an illustration of the character of President Washington the collection is of

capital excellence. Here is a portion of his career as president in which he had a free hand, unhampered by Congress or by the actions of foreign governments. It shows in full detail the qualities of Washington the administrator—his sobriety of judgment, his severe sense of legality, his care in details, his union of personal firmness with consideration for others, and in general the secure touch of the man who for twenty years had been almost incessantly occupied with public duties. In aesthetic matters he puts forward his opinion with great modesty and deference, bnt is usually right. After he ceases to be president the letters relate mostly to the mansion which, with characteristic care for details, he is erecting for his own residence. Several letters of much interest are concerned with the project of a national university, and one or two relate to the projected transfer of the faculty of the University of Geneva, which has been known hitherto in connection with the name of Jefferson, but which it seems was also suggested by John Adams.

The Diary of William Bentley, D.D., Pastor of the East Church, Salem, Massachusetts. Volume IV., 1811–1819. (Salem, Essex Institute, 1914, pp. 737.) This fourth volume of Dr. Bentley's diary is the last of a series undeniably interesting; just how valuable or important is a question that requires definitions. The value of a diary written in an American town of twelve thousand inhabitants, even in a period including the War of 1812, depends on the town and the quality of the observer. The town was Salem, in which the diarist was a minister of the established Congregational church from 1783 to 1819. Few American towns of that time were more important or more interesting, and, while much of this voluminous record is a chronicle of small beer, after all the book is published for purposes of local history, and meets them with great wealth of detail. Dr. Bentley was a man of learning and a clergyman, but this volume has relatively little to say of books or of theology, and there are almost no introspective passages. The reverend doctor was a downright, practical, active-minded man, intensely and broadly interested in what went on around him, and gives therefore a minute and varied account of all sorts of events, a rather wonderful photograph of the life of his burgh in all its aspects—building, business, fishing, privateering, soldiering, politics, elections, church doings, music, visits of distinguished persons, gossip, little excursions, storms, seasons, births, marriages, and deaths. The latter give rise to numberless brief biographies of Salem folk, mostly plain Americans, whose character and careers are outlined with insight and clearness. But strong prejudices appear in these vignettes and elsewhere. The doctor was an unenthusiastic parson of the old school, practically a Unitarian, and viewed the new sects and the more "evangelical" and orthodox lights of his own church with contemptuous dislike. In politics, however, his sympathies were in general with the Democrats, though some Democratic men and measures were far from receiving his favor. We are not to look for the most discerning statements concerning public characters from one who can say of

Joseph Story in 1815, "His brainless ambition and deficient principles promise nothing good to his influence"; but as a picture of a community the book has few rivals. This fourth volume contains a minute subject-index to the whole series.

Der Deutschamerikanische Farmer: sein Anteil an der Eroberung und Kolonisation der Bundesdomäne der Ver. Staaten besonders in den Nord Centralstaaten. Von Joseph Och. (Columbus, Ohio, *Ohio Waisenfreund*, 1913, pp. ix, 248.) The one strong impression which this work gives, is that of the enormous quantitative influence of the German farmer in the United States during the latter half of the nineteenth century. The book is mainly a discussion of the statistical matter bearing on the subject, found in the reports of the Twelfth Census of the United States; those of the Census of 1910 were not yet available when the author did his work. He shows that in 1900 persons of German parentage owned and cultivated 522,252 farms, or 10.6 per cent. of all farm homes in the United States, and almost as much as the combined holdings of the next three largest farm-holding foreign elements, the English (and Welsh) with 183,157, the Irish with 176,968, the Scandinavian with 174,694, together 534,819 farm homes. (Twelfth Census, vol. II., *Population*, part II., p. 742.) During each decade between 1870 and 1900 the German immigration increased its holdings to the extent of 120,000 farm homes. The rate of increase exceeds that of the other most successful national elements named. The German farmer has settled most thickly and is most prosperous in the North Central district, which represents the backbone of agricultural wealth in the United States. Among other interesting subjects which the author treats is that of the migrations of the native population, who in their new location enter into industrial pursuits somewhat more frequently than the foreign population, leaving to the latter a proportionately larger share of the farming. The author's arrangement of his material is in many cases not happy, and he would have gained in clearness by the exclusion of matter irrelevant.

The book attempts also a quantitative estimate of the farmer of German blood, whose ancestry goes back to the early nineteenth or to the eighteenth century in America. It does not, however, as the title might imply, give a qualitative estimate of the German farmer's work at any period. Such questions as extensive and intensive farming, products raised, changing of crops, improvements made, are hardly touched upon in this work. The influence, *e. g.*, of the small farm upon the agricultural success and stability of the nation is an interesting subject for investigation. In this respect the Pennsylvania German farmer of the eighteenth, and the Wisconsin farmer of the nineteenth, century furnished an object lesson. These small farmers did their work well with their own hands, assisted by their families; they bought more land when they had the money to pay for it; they did not take large farms with heavy mortgages, which might turn them out of house and home in a bad season.

The book of Dr. Och is mainly statistical, though valuable in its very limited field.

A. B. FAUST.

An Artilleryman's Diary. By Jenkin Lloyd Jones. [Wisconsin History Commission, Original Papers, no. 8.] (Wisconsin History Commission, 1914, pp. xviii, 395.) Dr. Jones served as a private in the 6th Wisconsin battery from August, 1862, until July, 1865. But few days in this period are without an entry in the diary and as a result we have a complete story of the life of a private soldier. Incidents of the camp and march, comments upon the country and the people, the latest word by grape-vine, grumblings and gossip, are all duly noted. The dullness of months spent at the same station is often reflected with an accuracy that will discourage the general reader; but the student who persists to the end will be amply rewarded.

Throughout the diary there are constant references to the demoralization caused by drunkenness. It must have been difficult to maintain discipline when officers "staggered into camp beastly drunk" and brawled about "while the boys flocked around to see 'the example set'". There seems to have been much "foraging" and "jay-hawking", but Dr. Jones is right when he declares that "the bulk of the Union Army so largely composed of boys was of stern stuff with their lives rooted in seriousness and committed to sobriety".

The diary give the writer's experiences with the battery in the expedition down the Mississippi and the Yazoo in the spring of 1863, in the operations before and during the siege of Vicksburg and when it formed part of Sherman's army in the forced march to Chattanooga and in the fighting at Missionary Ridge. Then followed over a year and a half of service in station at Huntsville, Alabama, Etowah Bridge, Georgia (near Allatoona), Nashville, and Chattanooga. At the battle of Nashville, the battery was held in reserve. The evidence the diary offers as to the weather conditions immediately before the battle is of special interest.

We think the publications of the commission deserve better printing.

The Quakers of Iowa. By Louis Thomas Jones. (Iowa City, Iowa, the State Historical Society of Iowa, 1914, pp. 360.) The State Historical Society of Iowa has made possible this volume on *The Quakers of Iowa*, written by Dr. Louis T. Jones while a research assistant for the society. The author is a Friend, well known to many of that denomination, having lived in four different states where Friends are numerous, and has had access therefore to an abundance of material which an outsider might not have been able to obtain.

The book is in five parts, including Historical Narrative, Iowa Quaker Orthodoxy, Minority Bodies of Friends, Benevolent and Educational Enterprizes, and Religious and Social Life. The first part deals briefly with the rise and spread of Quakerism in England and America

and traces the history of Quakerism in Iowa from its origin in 1835 to the present. The second part gives a history of the change which has taken place in the application of the orthodox ideas of the members as they pertain to essentials in belief and practice. The third part gives a brief history of the various smaller bodies of Friends in the state with an account of the causes leading to the separations which have taken place. The fourth part outlines the work of Iowa Friends in educational and missionary activities together with chapters on their labors in behalf of the negroes and American Indians. The fifth part gives a summary of the religious beliefs of Iowa Friends together with an account of their home life and distinctive manners and customs.

The 441 notes and references grouped together at the end of the work add very distinctly to the value of this contribution. The book is also provided with a full and carefully prepared index. It is written in good style and is both interesting and highly instructive. It contains much material of general interest about Friends and is a valuable contribution to Quaker literature.

HARLOW LINDLEY.

Retrospection: Political and Personal. By Hubert Howe Bancroft. (New York, The Bancroft Company, 1912, pp. x, 562.)

The New Pacific. By Hubert Howe Bancroft. Revised edition. (New York, The Bancroft Company, 1912, pp. x, 549.) As a work of historical or of contemporaneously critical value no very high rank can be given to this *Retrospection* from Mr. Bancroft's pen. But as a human document, as impressionistic testimony, the book has a value of its own, coming as it does from a man who reached San Francisco in 1852—from an eye-witness of events in California through six decades. And it is not only his own experiences that Mr. Bancroft had to do with. We all learn how he interested himself at an early stage of Californian history in searching out what pertained to the beginnings and growth of human occupation in all that great stretch of country over which Spain had spread, little by little, her imported civilization, mingled with what was there before her entrance into the continent. He was curious about the past when it had hardly slipped from the present, and that timely curiosity saved what would have been lost had it not been for him. His words cannot be neglected. But it must be confessed that they do not compose into a masterpiece of literature. Into the rather rambling phrases that fill over five hundred pages, are packed desultory recollections and fortuitous comment on men and events. The sketch of his own life and purposes is subordinated to this collateral subject-matter. The inconsistencies of law, the failure of justice to be ethical or even practical, the graft and grafters that California has known, the advantage of popular rule rather than representative government, laudation of referendum and recall, are among the topics that receive his vigorous lashings or approval. As he does not scruple to mention names freely both

in praise and blame, some passages are racy reading. For instance, he cannot say enough about his admiration for Theodore Roosevelt and Hiram Johnson, while he does not veil his feelings in regard to the founder of one Californian university—feelings which are the reverse of sympathetic. Thus, as first-hand conclusions about past California in the passing, the volume may be of aid to a later historian.

The New Pacific is no longer so very new, even in this new edition, and the reality and romance of the great South Sea that it touches on are more or less familiar, now that the world has grown used to anticipating the passage through the canal into that island-dotted sea with its potential future. In spite of the romance it suggests, the book is less readable than the *Retrospection*, redeemed from its verbosity by its unmistakable personal touch. Here there is too much matter. The gist could be put into much smaller compass to advantage. Undoubtedly it will be. For many speeches will have to be made in 1915 and here is a useful mine of suggestion for pertinent matter.

Biografía de J. Félix Ribas. Por Juan Vicente González. [Biblioteca de Grandes Autores Americanos.] (Paris, Garnier Hermanos, 1913, pp. lxxxix, 262.) The biography of José Félix Ribas is a volume in a series which contains certain productions of prominent authors and publicists of Spanish America. This volume is a reprint of a book which is not found in many libraries of North America. A preface furnishes meagre information in regard to the author, Juan Vicente González, who lived and died in the city of Carácas. This preface is followed by a discussion of "La Proclama de Guerra á Muerte" by the editor of the reprint, R. Blanco-Fombona. The editor discusses the inherited, psychological, and environmental influences, which, in his opinion, explain or justify the proclamation of the war to the death against the Spaniards which Bolívar made at Trujillo on June 15, 1813.

The introduction is followed by González's biography of Ribas, 1775–1815, a relative of Simón de Bolívar who figured in the revolt of Venezuela against Spain. This biography, which is based in part upon rare contemporary material, for example, the *Gaceta de Carácas*, describes in some detail that dramatic period of Venezuelan history which extended from 1809 to 1815. After mentioning the rôle of Ribas as a member of the provisional government which was established at Carácas in 1810, a narrative is given of his career as a military commander until he was put to death by the royalists. The attitude of Simón de Bolívar and of Antonio Nicolás Briceño towards the war to the death is discussed, and suggestions are made of the evil influence which that war exerted upon the life and manners of the Venezuelans. This biography contains some errors and some misleading statements; it was written about fifty years ago and was based partly upon tradition. It contains some interesting but overdrawn portraits of Venezuelan leaders: Miranda, who "bore the torch of the revolution from France", Boves, "the ferocious pirate",

Arismendi, "the bloody ogre, the Bluebeard of America". The style of González is vivid: the book contains some graphic descriptions of events: the first constituent congress of Venezuela is described as being composed of leaders "who desired to reach the promised land without crossing the Red Sea". This reprint will be useful to some students of South American history not only because it contains some rare original material which concerns the history of Venezuela, but also because it makes available a biography which conveys the atmosphere of the revolutionary era.

W. S. Robertson.

Discursos y Proclamas. Por Simón Bolivar. Compilados, anotados, prologados, y publicados por R. Blanco-Fombona. [Biblioteca de Grandes Autores Americanos.] (Paris, Garnier Hermanos, 1913, pp. xlvii, 302.) This volume contains a large number of the speeches and proclamations of Simón de Bolivar, liberator of Colombia, Peru, and Bolivia. Almost fifty pages are taken up by an introduction which was written by the editor, R. Blanco-Fombona, a Venezuelan scholar who has displayed a special interest in the liberator's career. The introduction contains a sympathetic but exalted estimate of the liberator as a literary artist: the editor declares that the writings of Bolivar constitute the best expression of his age in the Castilian tongue: "in literature he was also the liberator".

There is only one note appended to the discourses and proclamations which deals with the provenance of the documents which Blanco-Fombona reprints; that note is concerned only with Bolivar's last proclamation, of December 10, 1830. With this exception the reader is not explicitly referred to the collections from which the documents are taken. The absence of critical notes is to be regretted; for the texts of the discourses and proclamations which are printed by Blanco-Fombona do not always conform exactly to the texts which are found in the monumental collections of Boliviana that were edited by J. F. Blanco and S. B. O'Leary. Unless indeed the process of rectification which certain Venezuelan scholars have applied to the letters of Bolivar has recently been applied to his discourses and proclamations, errors have been made in reading the proof. Some of the documents which are contained in this volume are preceded by explanatory notes. The discourses and proclamations which are reprinted by Blanco-Fombona are dated from 1811 to 1830; the work of selecting the documents for publication was well done. Among the discourses are: the speech of Bolivar to the patriotic society of Carácas, July 3, 1811; his speeches to the congress of Angostura in 1819; and his discourse to the congress of the republic of Bolivia which was sent to Chuquisaca along with his project of a constitution for Bolivia. The proclamations in this volume were issued from 1813 to 1830: they are mostly stirring addresses which the liberator directed to the soldiers of his army and to civilians: Venezuelans, Colombians,

Spaniards, and Peruvians. This volume is accordingly a convenient collection of original material which deals with the political ideas and the military campaigns of the remarkable warrior-statesman who exercised so profound an influence upon the fortunes of northern South America during the heroic age.

W. S. Robertson.

NOTES AND NEWS

AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

The annual meeting of the American Historical Association will be held in Chicago, December 29–31. The headquarters of the Association will be at the Auditorium Hotel and all sessions will probably be held there with the exception of that devoted to the address of the president, Professor McLaughlin, which will be read at the Art Institute. The programme, while not yet completed, is sufficiently definite to warrant the announcements which follow. In ancient history, Babylonian, Egyptian, and Roman history will be represented by Professors Rogers of Drew Theological Seminary, Breasted of Chicago, and Westermann of Wisconsin; and Mr. Wallace E. Caldwell of Columbia University will have a paper dealing with "The Greek Attitude towards War and Peace". In medieval history Professor Haskins of Harvard will deal with "The Greek Renaissance of the Twelfth Century"; Professor Lunt of Cornell with "The Lyons Tenth, 1274–1280"; Dr. Harvey of Chicago with "Economic Self-Interest in the German Anticlericalism of the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries". Professor E. W. Dow of Michigan will also have a paper. In the history of medieval England there will be papers by Miss Bertha H. Putnam of Mt. Holyoke College, upon "Maximum Wage Laws for Priests after the Black Death"; by Professor James F. Baldwin of Vassar College; by Professor J. F. Willard of Colorado College, on "The Revolution in the Exchequer under Edward I."; and by Professor N. M. Trenholme of the University of Missouri, on "Municipal Aspects of the Rising of 1381". In the session on modern England there will be papers by Professors C. W. Colby and G. M. Wrong; by Professor Edward R. Turner of Michigan on "The Privy Council of 1679"; and by Professor Shipman of Princeton on John Wilkes.

The year 1914–1915 being the one-hundredth anniversary of the fall of Napoleon, it has seemed appropriate to emphasize Napoleonic history. To this end there will be a conference upon its study, at which Professor George M. Dutcher of Wesleyan University will read a paper dealing with the opportunities and the needs of such research in the United States. This paper will be followed by a discussion. In addition there will be a special session devoted to the Napoleonic era, in which papers will be read by Professor Ford of the University of Minnesota on "Boyen's Military Law"—foundation of the Prussian service; by Professor R. M. Johnston of Harvard entitled "An Approach to a Study of Napoleon's Generalship"; by Professor Victor Coffin of Wisconsin and

by Professor Henry E. Bourne of Western Reserve University on "The Men who helped to make the Napoleonic Régime".

Another special feature of the programme is to be a session devoted to the relations of Europe and the Orient. In this Professor Theodore F. Jones of New York will deal with some topic connected with the relations of Venice to the East; Professor Frederick Duncalf of the University of Texas promises a paper on some phase of the social structure of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem; Professor Albert H. Lybyer of the University of Illinois will read upon "Changes in the Trade Routes of Europe between 1291 and 1571"; Dr. Robert H. Lord of Harvard upon some topic connected with the relations of Russia in Asia.

"The Significance of Sectionalism in American History" will be the subject of Professor Frederick J. Turner of Harvard. Other papers in American history will be by Mr. Henry B. Learned of Washington on "Cabinet Meetings under Jackson"; Mr. Alfred H. Stone of Mississippi on "The Factorage System of the Southern States", and by Professors Farrand of Yale and Sioussat of Vanderbilt University.

It is planned to have the session on Wednesday evening, December 30, representative of the whole field of history. Provision has also been made for meetings of the archivists, of the historical societies, and of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association. The formal programme, to be distributed later, will contain detailed information as to hotel facilities, railroad rates, and the like.

The *Annual Report* for 1912 has been distributed to members, and is noticed elsewhere (p. 184). Of that for 1913, composition upon which could not be begun till the opening of the present fiscal year, the first volume is at the Government Printing Office. The second will consist of the papers of James A. Bayard the elder, Federalist representative in Congress and senator and one of the five commissioners in the negotiations at Ghent. The papers, which have been edited for the Historical Manuscripts Commission by Miss Elizabeth P. Donnan of the Carnegie Institution of Washington, are of great interest, covering all parts of Bayard's public career, but with especial fullness his diplomatic mission, for which there is an entertaining diary in addition to the letters. Most of the materials come from the collection possessed by Mr. Richard H. Bayard of Baltimore.

Miss Violet Barbour's Adams Prize essay, *Henry Bennet, Earl of Arlington*, is in the press and nearly ready for publication.

In the series of *Original Narratives of Early American History*, Messrs. Charles Scribner's Sons will issue this autumn *Narratives of the Insurrections, 1675–1691*, edited by Professor Charles M. Andrews, and embracing narratives of Bacon's Rebellion and of the outbreaks in North Carolina, Maryland, Massachusetts, and New York (Leisler).

In the absence of Professor Merriman, Professor Arthur L. Cross of the University of Michigan has been made treasurer of the Committee

on a Bibliography of Modern English History. Subscriptions, of which more are of course desired, may be sent to him at Ann Arbor.

PERSONAL

Professor Ralph Charles Henry Catterall of Cornell University died suddenly on August 2, at the age of forty-eight. He had taught eight years in the University of Chicago, and twelve at Ithaca, where he was professor of modern European history. His book on *The Second Bank of the United States* is recognized as of exceptional ability; but his unusual learning in modern history and his extraordinary powers of thought would have been still more clearly revealed by the works which his recent illness and untimely death prevented him, to the regret of many warm and admiring friends, from bringing to a conclusion.

Abner C. Goodell, of Salem, Massachusetts, died there on July 20, at the age of eighty-four. A notable lawyer, a collector of books, a scholar of remarkably extensive and accurate learning in Massachusetts history, Mr. Goodell was occupied from 1865 to 1890 as editor of the *Acts and Resolves of the Province of Massachusetts Bay*.

Robert A. Brock, for many years corresponding Secretary of the Virginia Historical Society and of the Southern Historical Society, died in Richmond, July 12, aged seventy-five years. He edited eleven volumes of the *Collections* of the former society, and many volumes published by the latter, and was of great service in keeping the cause of history alive in Virginia in evil and difficult times.

Professor P. Orman Ray of Pennsylvania State College has been elected professor of history in Trinity College (Hartford, Connecticut).

Professor Franklin L. Riley has been called from the University of Mississippi to be professor of history in Washington and Lee University. Dr. James E. Winston of Princeton University has been appointed professor of history in his stead, in the University of Mississippi.

Dr. Bernadotte E. Schmitt of Western Reserve University has been made assistant professor of history in that institution.

Dr. Solon J. Buck has been appointed assistant professor of history in the University of Minnesota; Dr. Wallace Notestein has been promoted to an associate professorship in the same institution; Dr. Theodore C. Pease, who has lately completed his report on the local archives of Illinois, takes Dr. Buck's place as research assistant in the Illinois Historical Survey.

GENERAL

The Nineteenth International Congress of Americanists, which was to meet at Washington in this present month of October, has been postponed till some time when the international character of the gathering can be insured.

All members of the American Historical Association are invited to attend the meeting of the New England History Teachers' Association on the evening of October 23 in Boston. The topic will be recent English history. The list of speakers will include Messrs. Edward Porritt and George L. Fox.

A French translation of Dr. Eduard Fueter's *Geschichte der Neueren Historiographie* has been published by the house of Félix Alcan, Paris (pp. vii, 785), under the title *Histoire de l'Historiographie Moderne*. The translator is Émile Jeanmaire, and the author has added somewhat to the text and contributed more notes. As the make-up of the book is superior to that of the German edition, the translation will probably find its way to shelves where the original stands already. It is unnecessary to repeat that this book should, in any case, be on the five-foot shelf of every student of modern history.

Henri Berr, the editor of the *Revue de Synthèse Historique*, has arranged for the publication of a *Bibliothèque de Synthèse Historique*, to have as its general title *L'Évolution de l'Humanité*, and to embrace one hundred volumes. The list of the fifty-one volumes assigned to ancient and medieval history and of their authors will be found at pages 338–342 of the April issue of the *Revue de Synthèse Historique*. The remaining volumes will be divided about equally between the modern and the contemporary periods. The price has been fixed at four francs a volume, by the publishers, Mignot and Tallandier of Paris.

There has been formed in connection with the Göttingen Academy a commission on the history of religions which has undertaken the preparation and publication of a collection, in the German language, of *Quellen der Religionsgeschichte* (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht). The editorial work has been intrusted to Professors Andreas, Otto, and Titius. The volumes of the earlier undertaking, *Religions-Urkunden der Völker*, have been incorporated in the new series as the first three volumes. Where desirable, critical editions of the original texts will be published in a separate series.

Professor Georges Renard of the College of France is the editor of a co-operative *Histoire Universelle du Travail* (Paris, Alcan) in twelve volumes. There have already appeared B. Nogaro and W. Oualid, *L'Évolution du Commerce depuis Cent Cinquante Ans*; G. Renard and A. Dulac, *L'Évolution Industrielle et Agricole depuis Cent Cinquante Ans*; P. Louis, *Le Travail dans le Monde Romain*, and Capitan and Lorin, *Le Travail en Amérique avant et après Colomb*.

The *Bulletin* of the New York Public Library continues its list of works relating to Scotland, and begins in the July and August numbers an important and minutely prepared list of newspapers and official gazettes possessed by the library, arranged in alphabetical order of places, extending, in the two issues named, to New London.

The second volume of the *Continental Legal History* series, edited by Sir John Macdonald and Edward Manson, entitled *Great Jurists of the World*, contains biographies of twenty-six great jurists. The sketches, many of which were originally published in the *Journal of Comparative Legislation*, are divided into four periods: "(1) that in which Roman Law was developed; (2) that in which it was regarded as the common law of Continental countries; (3) the period of the supremacy of natural law in many of its forms; (4) the age of codes and legislation".

The British Academy has lately published, in volume VI. of its *Proceedings*, and separately, two more of the papers read before the International Congress of Historical Studies in April, 1913, that of Professor Silvanus P. Thompson on *The Rose of the Winds: the Origin and Development of the Compass-Card*, and that of Professor C. H. Firth on *The Study of Modern History in Great Britain*.

Major-General Edward A. Altham, one of the most expert students of military history in the British army, brought out just before the outbreak of the present war the first volume of *The Principles of War, Historically Illustrated* (Macmillan) in which the uses of infantry, cavalry, and artillery, machine guns and engineers, communications and orders, and other means of warfare are studied with great freshness of view and with abundant illustration from history, especially from the history of our Civil War, and of the South African and Russo-Japanese wars.

From Messrs. Scribner comes volume VI. of the *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, which extends from "Fiction" to "Hyksos".

Part VI. of the new edition of *The Golden Bough*, by J. G. Frazer, *The Scapegoat*, studies the various ways in which primitive man transferred the evils from which he suffered to inanimate objects, animals, or human beings.

Mrs. Anna Robeson Burr, who five years ago published a notable book on the autobiography as a literary *genre*, has given in her *Religious Confessions and Confessants* (Boston, Houghton Mifflin) a penetrating and brilliant study of an element in human nature and experience which has had its importance in, and of which she draws examples from, every period of human history.

A body of papers of the late Mr. Henry C. Lea, relative to the subject of witchcraft, and partly prepared by him for publication, has been placed in the hands of Professor George L. Burr, who hopes before long to present them in the form of a book, under some such title as *A History of Witchcraft, edited from the Published and Unpublished Materials of Henry C. Lea.*

Ancient Rome and Modern America: a Comparative Study of Morals and Manners, by Guglielmo Ferrero, gives little attention to ancient Rome, but comments on dominant traits of modern civilization.

The two volumes of the collected *Historisch-Politische Aufsätze und Reden* of Professor H. Oncken (Munich, Oldenbourg, 1914, pp. vii, 344; 381) relate mainly to Germany during the last century, but include the address on America and the Great Powers. Other volumes of historical essays recently published are G. Schmoller's *Charakterbilder* (Munich, Duncker and Humblot, 1913); G. Morin's *Études, Textes, Découvertes, Contributions à la Littérature et à l'Histoire des Douze Premiers Siècles* (Abbey of Maredsous, 1913, pp. xii, 526); Professor A. Chuquet's *Historiens et Marchands d'Histoire, Notes Critiques sur de récents Ouvrages* (Paris, Fontemoing, 1914) and *Études d'Histoire* (seventh series, *ibid.*); Dr. Cabanès's *Fous Couronnés* (Paris, Michel, 1914), which includes essays on Philip II., Peter the Great, Christian VII., and Lewis II. of Bavaria; and Professor H. Cordier's *Mélanges d'Histoire et de Géographie Orientales* (Paris, Maisonneuve, 1914). Among the recently published presentation volumes of essays are *Mélanges Holleaux* (Paris, Picard, 1914), relating to Greek antiquities; *Mélanges Thévenin* (Paris, Champion, 1914), relating to French institutions; *Études d'Histoire Juridique offertes à Paul Frédéric Girard* (Paris, Geuthner, 1913, 2 vols., pp. xxi, 442; 549); *Mélanges offerts à M. Henri Lemonnier* (Paris, Champion, 1913, pp. xvi, 563), on the history of art; and *Miscellanea di Studi Storici in Onore di Antonio Manno* (Turin, 1913, 2 vols.), on Italian history.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: A. D. Xenopol, *Natur und Geschichte* (Historische Zeitschrift, CXIII. 1); W. Goetz, *Historischer Unterricht und Historische Forschungsinstitute* (Vergangenheit und Gegenwart, IV. 4); J. W. Thompson, *The Mendacity of History* (North American Review, June); S. R. Steinmetz, *Die Bedeutung des Krieges bei den Kulturvölkern* (Zeitschrift für Socialwissenschaft, May, June); A. B. Show, *Die Kulturgeschichtschreibung Karl Lamprechts* (Vergangenheit und Gegenwart, IV. 2; see also correspondence, *ibid.*, IV. 3, ff. 197–199, IV. 4, p. 270, and Seeliger in Historische Vierteljahrschrift, XXV. 2, pp. 288–290); E. Hennig, *Der Geschichtsunterricht in den Vereinigten Staaten* (Vergangenheit und Gegenwart, IV. 4).

ANCIENT HISTORY

General reviews: Seymour de Ricci, *Bulletin Papyrologique, 1905–1912* (Revue des Études Grecques, April); P. Ducati, *Die Neuere Etruskische Forschung* (Die Geisteswissenschaften, May 7).

The Prussian Academy has undertaken the task of photographing and accurately describing all representations of foreigners on ancient Egyptian works of art. In *Sitzungsberichte*, 1913, XXXVIII. 769–801, Professor Eduard Meyer gives a report of an expedition for the purpose, led by Dr. Max Burchardt.

Professor A. T. Clay has completed part II. of *Babylonian Records in the Library of J. Pierpont Morgan*, for which he has selected fifty-

six tablets of a legal nature dealing with Babylonian history from 312 to 65 B. C.

Professor Robert W. Rogers of Drew Theological Seminary has occupied himself, during a year's leave of absence spent at Oxford, in rewriting his *History of Babylonia and Assyria* for a new edition.

René Dussaud has thoroughly revised and greatly enlarged his *Les Civilisations Préhelléniques dans le Bassin de la Mer Égée* in a second edition (Paris, Geuthner, 1914, pp. x, 482). More than three hundred illustrations enrich the work. The chapter on Aegean influence in Egypt and Syria is new. J. J. Courcelle-Seneuil has published *Héraclès, Les Égéens sur les Côtes Occidentales de l'Europe vers le XVI^e^ Siècle avant notre Ère* (Paris, Leroux, 1914).

A very useful handbook, with numerous references to authorities, is Dr. Peter Thomsen's *Kompendium der Palästinischen Alterthumskunde* (Tübingen, Mohr, 1913, pp. 109).

The sixth volume of Iwan Müller's *Handbuch der Klassischen Alterthumswissenschaft* will be a comprehensive *Handbuch der Archäologie*, by Heinrich Bulle and other scholars, in fifteen parts, of which the first (Munich, Beck, pp. 184) has already appeared.

Athens and its Monuments, by Professor C. H. Weller (Macmillan), is a clear and concise account of the remains of the ancient city, frequently based on the work of the American School at Athens.

The third volume of Eugène Cavaignac's *Histoire de l'Antiquité* deals with Macedon, Carthage, and Rome from 330 to 107 B. C. (Paris, Fontemoing, 1914). For the same period, R. Schubert has prepared *Die Quellen zur Geschichte der Diadochenzeit* (Leipzig, Dieterich, 1914).

An *Histoire des Machabées ou Princes de la Dynastie Asmonéenne* has been written by F. de Saulcy (Paris, Leroux, 1914). A recent German publication on *Rom und die Hasmonäer* is by O. Roth (Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1914).

A study of *The Auxilia of the Roman Imperial Army*, by G. L. Cheesman, is announced for speedy publication by the Oxford University Press.

Miss Susan H. Ballou of the University of Chicago issues in a pamphlet of eighty-nine pages (Leipzig, Teubner) a minute and thoroughgoing discussion of *The Manuscript Tradition of the Historia Augusta*, with several plates and facsimiles.

In *Cäsaren-Porträts* (Bonn, Marcus and Weber, 1914, pp. 39), Dr. Ernst Müller, a physician, makes a study of the coin and sculpture portraits of the imperial personages of the first three centuries to trace family resemblances where possible.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: E. Naville, *L'Origine Africaine de la Civilisation Égyptienne* (Revue Archéologique, July, 1913); H.

Winckler, *Vorderasien im zweiten Jahrtausend* [B. C.] *auf Grund Archivalischer Studien* (Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft, XVIII. 4); F. von Luschan, *Beiträge zur Anthropologie von Kreta* (Zeitschrift für Ethnologie, XLV. 3); P. Gardner, *Coinage of the Athenian Empire* (Journal of Hellenic Studies, XXXIII. 2); E. Kornemann, *Zur Altitalischen Verfassungsgeschichte* (Klio, XIV. 2); W. Soltau, *Der Ursprung der Diktatur* (Hermes, XLIX. 3); H. Gummerus, *Die Römische Industrie: Wirtschaftsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen* (Klio, XIV. 2); P. A. Seymour, *The Policy of Livius Drusus the Younger* (English Historical Review, July); F. Weege, *Das Goldene Haus des Nero* (Jahrbuch des Kaiserlich Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, XXVIII. 2).

EARLY CHURCH HISTORY

Among the recent discussions of the origins of Christianity are C. Guignebert's *Le Problème de Jésus* (Paris, Flammarion, 1914, pp. viii, 192, reviewed by A. Loisy, *Revue Critique*, May 16); and Professor C. Clemen's *Der Einfluss der Mysterienreligionen auf das älteste Christentum* (Giessen, Töpelmann, 1913, pp. 88, reviewed by A. Loisy, *Revue Critique*, May 23), a supplement to his larger book on the same subject.

Monsignor Pierre Batiffol has published *La Paix Constantinienne et le Catholicisme* (Paris, Gabalda, 1914, pp. viii, 542) in continuation of his *L'Église Naissante et le Catholicisme*, which is now in the sixth edition. The relations between Christianity and the Roman Empire are also the subject of Fracassini's *L'Impero e il Cristianesimo da Nerone a Costantino* (Perugia, Bartelli and Verando, 1914) and of C. Boucaud's *La Première Ébauche d'un Droit Chrétien dans le Droit Romain, Contribution aux Fêtes Constantiniennes* (Paris, Tralin, 1914).

The *Revue des Deux Mondes* published during 1913 a life of St. Augustine by M. Louis Bertrand, which has been translated by Vincent O'Sullivan and is now published by D. Appleton and Company. The work is a sympathetic history of the man, not a doctrinal study.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: P. Corssen, *Die Zeugnisse des Tacitus und Pseudo-Josephus über Christus* (Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde des Urchristentums, XV. 2); A. Jäggli, *Von Konstantin zu Augustinus, Gedanken zur Entstehung der Mittelalterlichen Gottesstaatsidee*, I. (Schweizerische Theologische Zeitschrift, XXXI. 1).

MEDIEVAL HISTORY

Reference Studies in Mediaeval History by Professor James W. Thompson of Chicago (pp. xviii, 233) is a revised and enlarged edition of his syllabus printed in 1907. It is a syllabus of subjects, rather than of individual lectures, and could be profitably used by many other teach-

ers than its author. The topics are well selected. The best trait of the book is the modernness of its very abundant references. Misspellings of names are not infrequent.

The *Scriptores Rerum Merovingicarum*, in the *Monumenta*, is nearly finished. The sixth volume, *Passiones Vitaeque Sanctorum Aevi Merovingici*, ed. B. Krusch and W. Levison (Hannover, 1913, pp. 676), is important especially for the lives of St. Lambert of Liège and St. Wilfrid of York. The seventh will complete the series. During the year ending in April, 1914, also appeared part 3 of the fifth volume and part 1 of the sixth volume of *Constitutiones*, edited by Schwalm; the fifth volume of *Necrologia*, edited by Fuchs; and part 1 of the fifteenth volume of *Auctores Antiquissimi*, containing the *Opera* of Aldhelm, edited by Ehwald. Several other volumes are reported as nearly ready for publication. The commission plans to publish a notable group of volumes relating to fourteenth-century Germany, especially to Lewis the Bavarian and Charles IV.

Several studies of the economic conditions and relations of the monasteries during the Middle Ages have recently appeared. In continuation of Hansay's volume on the earlier history of Saint-Trond published in 1899, G. Simenon has done an admirable piece of work on *L'Organisation Économique de l'Abbaye de Saint-Trond depuis la Fin du XIII^e^ Siècle jusqu'au Commencement du XVII^e^ Siècle* (Brussels, Hayez, 1913, pp. 632, reviewed by J. Closon, *Le Musée Belge*, May). M. Garaud has written *L'Abbaye Sainte-Croix de Talmond en Bas-Poitou, circa 1049–1250, d'après le Cartulaire: Étude d'Histoire Économique et sur le Droit du Poitou au Moyen Âge* (Poitiers, Bouarez, 1914, pp. xvi, 219). A German monastery is studied in Söhn's *Geschichte des Wirtschaftlichen Lebens der Abtei Eberbach im Rheingau, vornehmlich im 15. und 16. Jahrhundert* (Wiesbaden, Bergmann, 1914). Other recent volumes on medieval monasteries are J. Heldwein, *Die Klöster Bayerns am Ausgange des Mittelalters* (Munich, Lindauer, 1913, pp. xv, 202); Klohn, *Die Entwicklung der Corveyer Schutz- und Vogteiverhältnisse* (Hildesheim, Lax, 1914); W. Hoppe, *Kloster Zinna* (Munich, Duncker and Humblot, 1914) in the *Veröffentlichungen des Vereins für Geschichte der Mark Brandenburg*; Brasse, *Geschichte der Stadt und Abtei Gladbach* (vol. I., Gladbach, Kerle, 1914). R. Charles and Menjot d'Elbenne have edited the *Cartulaire de l'Abbaye de Saint-Vincent du Mans, 572–1188* (Le Mans, Saint-Denis, 1914); and W. Ziesemer, *Das Marienburger Konventsbuch, 1399–1412* (Danzig, Kafemann, 1913).

Recent publications of documents relating to the history of universities include the long delayed second volume of the *Cartulaire de l'Université de Montpellier* (Montpellier, Mauriol, 1912, pp. clviii, 930), edited by J. Calmette; the first part of the second volume (1401–1440) of the *Codice Diplomatico della Università di Pavia* (Pavia, 1913); and the second volume of the *Chartularium Studii Bononiensis* (Bologna, 1914).

A second edition of Mr. Henry O. Taylor's *The Medieval Mind*, which adds a chapter on towns and gilds, and one on the influence of the Crusades, and makes some minor changes, has recently been issued by the Macmillan Company.

The formation of the kingdom of Burgundy is the subject of Dr. Adolf Hofmeister's *Deutschland und Burgund im früheren Mittelalter* (Leipzig, Dyk, 1914).

Dr. Louis J. Paetow opens the historical series of the *Memoirs of the University of California* by presenting *The Battle of the Seven Arts*, a French poem by the trouvère Henri d'Andeli. An introduction of some thirty pages discusses the general subject of the age-long conflict between classical and modern studies, the rise and decline of interest in the ancient classics in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and the present poem and its author. The writing is ascribed to the second quarter of the thirteenth century. Then follows, with full annotation, the text, scientifically established, a translation, and facsimiles of the two extant manuscripts of the poem.

G. Schlumberger is the author of an excellent account of the *Fin de la Domination Franque en Syrie après les Dernières Croisades, Prise de Saint-Jean-d'Acre en l'An 1291 par l'Armée du Soudan d'Égypte* (Paris, Plon, 1914). J. Delaville Le Roulx, who has already edited the *Cartulaire Général des Hospitaliers, 1100–1310*, and written a history of *Les Hospitaliers en Terre Sainte et à Chypre, 1100–1310*, has carried his studies further in *Les Hospitaliers à Rhodes jusqu' à la Mort de Philibert de Nailhac, 1310–1421* (Paris, Leroux, 1914).

The history of the Inquisition has received useful contributions in H. Theloe's *Die Ketzerverfolgungen im 11. und 12. Jahrhundert, ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Entstehung des Päpstlichen Ketzerinquisitionsgerichts* (Berlin, Rothschild, 1913, pp. iv, 176); and in L. Garzend's *L'Inquisition et l'Hérésie, Distinction de l'Hérésie Théologique et de l'Hérésie Inquisitoriale, à propos de l'Affaire Galilée* (Paris, Beauchesne, 1913, pp. xvi, 540, reviewed by E. Vacandard, *Revue des Questions Historiques*, April), which is an elaborate apology for the church in the Galileo case. *Die Ketzerpolitik der Deutschen Kaiser und Könige in den Jahren 1152–1254* by Dr. H. Köhler (Bonn, Marcus and Weber, 1914) supplements Dr. Theloe's work. J. Marx has published *L'Inquisition en Dauphiné, Étude sur le Développement et la Répression de l'Hérésie et de la Sorcellerie du XIV^e^ Siècle au Début du Règne de François I^er^* (Paris, Champion, 1914, pp. xxiii, 303).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: T. Nöldeke, *Die Tradition über das Leben Muhammeds* (Der Islam, V. 2); E. Jacobi, *Der Prozess im Decretum Gratiani und bei den ältesten Dekretisten* (Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung, Kanonistische Abteilung, XXXIV. 3); G. Baist, *Zur Interpretation der Brevium Exempla und des Capitulare de Villis* (Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte, XII. 1).

MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

The Hakluyt Society has published a volume of Spanish and Portuguese documents entitled *New Light on Drake: a Collection of Documents relating to his Voyage of Circumnavigation, 1557–1580.* The translator and editor is Mrs. Zelia Nuttall, whose remarkable discoveries in the Inquisition and other papers in the archives of Mexico and in other collections we have already described.

The minor defects of *Christina of Denmark, Duchess of Milan and Lorraine, 1522–1590,* by Julia Cartwright (Mrs. Ady) are overbalanced by the knowledge and skill of the author in rendering a faithful portrait of a woman of no inconsiderable prominence in European affairs.

J. Susta has published the fourth and concluding volume of his *Die Römische Kurie und das Konzil von Trient unter Pius IV.* (Vienna, Hölder, 1914). A volume on *Saint Pie V., 1504–1572* (Paris, Gabalda, 1914) by Abbé G. Grente finds place in the series, *Les Saints.* The first volume of the *Correspondencia Diplomática entre España y la Santa Sede durante el Pontificado de S. Pio V.* has been edited by L. Serrano (Rome, Istituto Pio IX., 1914). An important portion of the *Analecta Bollandiana,* XXXIII. 2, is occupied with a discussion, by Father François van Ortroy, of materials for the life of the same canonized pope Pius V.

The late Richard Waddington had practically completed before his death the fifth volume of *La Guerre de Sept Ans, Histoire Diplomatique et Militaire,* which has the sub-title, *Pondichéry, Villinghausen, Schweidnitz* (Paris, Firmin-Didot, 1914, pp. 451). Captain A. Dussauge has published under the auspices of the French general staff *Études sur la Guerre de Sept Ans: le Ministère de Belle-Isle, I. Krefeld et Lütterberg, 1758* (Paris, Fournier, 1914, pp. 486).

For the *Home University Library* Professor T. C. Smith has written *Wars between England and America.*

Several episodes in the diplomatic history of the Napoleonic period are dealt with in the following recent publications: R. Pétiet, *Gustave IV. Adolphe et la Révolution Française, Relations Diplomatiques de la France et de la Suède de 1792 à 1810, d'après des Documents d'Archives inédits* (Paris, Champion, 1914); W. Trummel, *Der Norddeutsche Neutralitätsverband, 1795–1807* (Hildesheim, Lax, 1913); M. Philippson, *Die Aeussere Politik Napoleons I.: der Friede von Amiens, 1802* (Leipzig, 1913, pp. 108); J. de la Tour, *Les Prémices de l'Alliance Franco-Russe, Deux Missions de Barthélemy de Lesseps à Saint-Petersburg, 1806–1807* (Paris, Perrin, 1914); F. Schmidt, *Sachsens Politik von Jena bis Tilsit, 1806–1807* (Leipzig, 1913, pp. vii, 100); F. Mehring, *1807–1812, Von Tilsit nach Tauroggen* (Stuttgart, Dietz, 1913); *Jean d'Ussel, Études sur l'Année 1813: la Défection de la Prusse: l'Intervention de l'Autriche* (2 vols., Paris, Plon, 1914); J. F. Hoff, *Die Mediatisiertenfrage in den Jahren 1813–1814* (Berlin, Rothschild, 1913, pp. xii, 127); and

Brendel, *Die Pläne einer Wiedergewinnung Elsass-Lothringens in den Jahren 1814 und 1815* (Strassburg, Heitz, 1914).

To the *Special Campaign* series, R. G. Burton has added *Napoleon's Invasion of Russia* (Macmillan).

M. Schalck de la Faverie of the Paris National Library is at work on a volume to be called *Napoléon et l'Amérique*, which is to discuss the interacting influence of France and America from the French Revolution to the First Empire.

It is to be expected that contributions and documents interesting to the student of American history will frequently be found in the new journal lately founded by the Franciscans of Spain, *Archivo Ibero-Americano*, devoted to the history of the Franciscans in Spain, Portugal, America, and the other missionary fields outside of Europe (Madrid, Paseo del Cisne, 12; subscription in foreign countries, 16 francs).

F. R. and P. Dareste have brought up to date their annotated French translations of *Les Constitutions Modernes, Recueil des Constitutions en Vigueur dans les divers États du Monde*, in a third edition (2 vols., Paris, Challamel, 1914).

The outbreak of the great war lends additional interest to such works as Professor Roland G. Usher's *Pan-Germanism* (Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1913) and Captain Henri Andrillon's *L'Expansion d'Allemagne* (Paris, Marcel Rivière, 1914). Both are primarily publicistic, but contain much interesting matter relating to recent history.

The present war has also given added interest to the following discussions of the problems of European diplomacy: A. Singer, *Geschichte des Dreibundes, mit einem Anhang—Der Inhalt des Dreibundes, eine Diplomatische Untersuchung von Hans F. Helmolt* (Leipzig, Rabinowitz, 1914, pp. viii, 293); H. Frederich, *Die Idee des Politischen Gleichgewichts* (Würzburg, Staudenraus, 1914, pp. 77); and M. Lecomte and C. Levi, *Neutralité Belge et Invasion Allemande, Histoire, Stratégie* (Paris, Charles-Lavauzelle, 1914, pp. 608), which includes a bibliography.

The publication of *Mes Souvenirs, 1830–1914* (Paris, Berger-Levrault, 1914) by Auguste Lalance, the Alsatian deputy whom Bismarck expelled from the Reichstag, attracted no little attention early in the present year. *L'Exode* (Paris, Hachette, 1914) by G. Delahache described the migration from Alsace-Lorraine after the cession. But the most notable successes in years in arousing public interest in the Alsace-Lorraine question have been the publications under the pseudonym, Oncle Hansi, especially the popular illustrated *Histoire d'Alsace* and *Mon Village* (Paris, Floury, 1913, 1914).

Many of the problems of European politics both internal and international at the beginning of 1914 have been discussed in articles in the *Revue Politique Internationale*, of which the first number was published in Paris in January. The outbreak of the present war has given these

articles a peculiar importance. Of similar significance are numerous articles in *Questions Diplomatiques et Coloniales, Revue de Politique Extérieure.*

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: G. d'Avenel, *Le Port des Lettres depuis Sept Siècles* (Revue des Deux Mondes, July 1); W. Goetz, *Renaissance und Antike* (Historische Zeitschrift, CXIII. 2); G. B. Picotti, *La Pubblicazione e i primi Effetti della "Execrabilis" di Pio II.* (Archivio della R. Società Romana di Storia Patria, XXXVII. 1); E. Dürr, *Karl der Kühne und der Ursprung des Habsburgisch-Spanischen Imperiums* (Historische Zeitschrift, CXIII. 1); Imbart de la Tour, *Renaissance et Réforme: la Religion des Humanistes* (Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Sciences Morales et Politiques, June); M. Dubruel, *Le Pape Alexandre VIII. et les Affaires de France*, I. (Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique, April); L. Delavaud, *Scènes de la Vie Diplomatique au XVIII^e Siècle, 1712–1714*, I. (Revue du Dix-Huitième Siècle, April); L. G. Wickham Legg, *Torcy's Account of Matthew Prior's Negotiations at Fontainebleau* (English Historical Review, July); E. Nys, *Le Droit de la Nature et le Droit des Gens au XVIII^e Siècle* (Revue de Droit International et de Législation Comparée, XVI. 3); E. Tarle, *Deutsch-Französische Wirtschaftsbeziehungen zur Napoleonischen Zeit* (Schmollers Jahrbuch, XXXVIII. 2); M. Escoffier, *Les Instructions de Lord Castlereagh, Plénipotentiaire Britannique au Congrès de Châtillon, 1813* (Revue des Études Napoléoniennes, July); P. Muret, *Alexandre II. et Napoléon III., d'après un Ouvrage Récent* [F. C. Roux] (Revue d'Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine, March); Dr. Hesselbarth, *Die Urheberschaft der Uebereinkunft von Gastein* (Historische Vierteljahrschrift, XXV. 2); J. B. Scott, *The Declaration of London of February 20, 1909* (American Journal of International Law, April); P. von Mitrofanoff, *Offener Brief über das Verhältnis von Russland und Deutschland, mit Vor- und Nachwort des Herausgebers* [H. Delbrück] (Preussische Jahrbücher, June).

GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

The Historical Association's *Annual Bulletin of Historical Literature*, no. 3, to be obtained from the secretary, Miss Curran, 6 South Square, Gray's Inn, London, presents in 43 pages a most useful survey, by competent authorities, of the leading books, mostly English and in English history, of the year 1913.

A *History of England and Greater Britain* by Professor Arthur L. Cross of the University of Michigan, in one large volume of 1165 pages, has just been published by the Macmillan Company.

The Macmillan Company has published *The Normans in England, 1066–1154*, by A. E. Bland (pp. 118), and *The Growth of Parliament and the War with Scotland, 1216–1307*, by W. D. Robieson.

The chief place in the *Analecta Bollandiana*, XXXIII. 2, is taken by the life of St. Lawrence O'Toole, archbishop of Dublin under Henry II., edited from the Codex Kilkenniensis by Dr. Charles Plummer.

The Canterbury and York Society is soon to publish the register of John Whyte, bishop of Winchester. Plans are also under way for further issues in the registers of John de Pontissara of Winchester, and Matthew Parker of Canterbury, and in those of the dioceses of Lincoln, London, Rochester, and Salisbury. A volume of *Visitations of Religious Houses, 1420–1426*, will form the extra part in 1914–1915.

The fourth volume of *Oxford Studies in Social and Legal History* which Professor Vinogradoff is editing, contains "The History of Contract in Early English Equity", by Mr. W. T. Barbour, and "The Abbey of Saint-Bertin and its Neighbourhood, 900–1350", by G. W. Coopland.

Innocenz IV. und England (Berlin, Göschen, 1914) by Dr. L. Dehio is a contribution to the study of the reign of Henry III.

Mr. Evan Macleod Barron has gathered together and published as *The Scottish War of Independence: a Critical Study* (Nisbet and Company) articles which he has contributed to *The Inverness Courier*. These are chiefly controversial in tone, his thesis being that the Highlands have been neglected in Scottish history.

The Church, the State, and the Poor: a Series of Historical Studies, by Dr. W. Edward Chadwick (Robert Scott), is an attempt to show how to improve social conditions of the present and future by a study of such conditions in the past, but it can scarcely be said that the historical survey adds much to our knowledge of English social history.

The Royal Fishery Companies of the Seventeenth Century, by John R. Elder (Maclehose), is a substantial piece of work on this phase of the economic history of England.

Sulgrave Manor, the home of the ancestors of George Washington, has been purchased by funds subscribed in Great Britain, and in July was handed over with appropriate ceremonies to members of the centennial committee having charge of the celebration of one hundred years of peace between the United States and Great Britain, to be held as a gift to the American people.

A full and careful catalogue of the library of Samuel Pepys at Magdalene College, Cambridge, is being published in London by Sidgwick and Jackson. Part I., describing the "Sea Manuscripts", mostly material gathered together by Pepys for his proposed history of the navy, has been prepared by Dr. J. R. Tanner; part II., embracing the early printed books before 1558, by E. Gordon Duff.

The Oxford University Press announces *The Legislative Union of England and Scotland*, by Professor P. Hume Brown of Edinburgh.

Mr. George H. Perris's *The Industrial History of Modern England* (Kegan Paul) is not a book founded on extensive original researches, but fills a useful gap by a survey of the whole period from the Industrial Revolution.

The second series of *The Lord Advocates of Scotland*, by G. W. T. Omond (London, Andrew Melrose, 1914, pp. xxiv, 360), gives us his account of the part the Lord Advocates played in the history of Scotland from 1834 to 1880.

Lord Charles Beresford's autobiography, *A Sailor's Life*, containing his recollections of the Egyptian war and the Sudan campaign, is being edited by Mr. L. Hope Cornford.

Professor F. J. C. Hearnshaw is the editor of a volume of lectures on the history of British colonization and its economic and political aspects. The contributors to the volume, which is entitled *King's College Lectures on Colonial Problems* (Macmillan), are Rev. T. J. Lawrence, who discusses the position of the colonies in international law, Sir John A. Cockburn, who deals with the Australian constitution, Sir Charles Lucas, whose subject is the Influence of Science on Empire, Professor H. E. Egerton, whose lecture, the Colonial Reforms of 1830, is perhaps the most purely historical of the volume, and Mr. Sidney Low, who writes on the Imperial Executive.

British government publications: *Calendar of the Justiciary Rolls of Proceedings in the Court of the Justiciar of Ireland*, preserved in the Public Record Office of Ireland, Edward I., part II., ed. James Mills; *Statute Rolls of the Parliament of Ireland*, 1–12 Edw. IV., ed. Henry F. Berry.

Other documentary publications: *Select Bills in Eyre, A. D. 1292–1333*, ed. W. C. Bolland (Selden Society); *Year-Books of 4 Edward II.* (A. D. 1310–1311), ed. G. J. Turner (Selden Society); *Records of the Worshipful Company of Carpenters*, vol. I., *Apprentices' Entry Books, 1654–1694*, ed. Bower Marsh (the Company).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: H. W. C. Davis, *The Canon Law of England* (Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung, Kanonistische Abteilung, XXXIV. 3); H. W. C. Davis, *The Chronicle of Battle Abbey* (English Historical Review, July); E. Re, *La Compagnia dei Riccardi in Inghilterra e il suo Fallimento alla Fine del Sec. XIII.* (Archivio della R. Società Romana di Storia Patria, XXXVII. 1–2); Conyers Read, *English Foreign Trade under Elizabeth* [doc.] (English Historical Review, July); T. S. Graves, *The Political Use of the Stage during the Reign of James I.* (Anglia, XXXVIII. 1); E. R. Turner, *The Lords Justices of England* (English Historical Review, July); G. Neilson, *Scotstarvet's "Trew Relation"*, III. (Scottish Historical Review, July); E. K. Broadus, *Poet Laureate and Historiographer Royal* (Nation, July 30); Yves Guyot, *J. Chamberlain et son Rôle Économique* (Journal des Économistes, July).

FRANCE

General review: G. Pagès and R. Guyot, *Histoire de France depuis 1660* (Revue Historique, July).

H. Gröhler has published a philological study—the first of its kind—*Ueber Ursprung und Bedeutung der Französischen Ortsnamen* (vol. I., Heidelberg, Winter, 1913, pp. xxiii, 377, reviewed by E. Gierach, *Zeitschrift für Französische Sprache und Literatur*, XLII. 6; by E. Clouzot, *Le Moyen Âge*, March). He deals with 70 Ligurian, 25 Iberian, 2 Phoenician, 8 Greek, 769 Gallic, and 487 Latin place-names. It is announced that the lectures of the late Professor Longnon on this subject are to be published. H. F. Delaborde will edit the lectures given at the College of France, and P. Marichal and L. Mirot those given at the École des Hautes Études.

Professor Camille Jullian of the College of France has used the author's manuscript and notes in revising and completing Fustel de Coulanges's *Histoire des Institutions Politiques de l'Ancienne France* in a new edition of which four volumes have appeared (Paris, Hachette, 1914).

Professor Paul Viard of the University of Lille has studied the *Histoire de la Dîme Ecclésiastique dans le Royaume de France* and has issued one volume on the twelfth and thirteenth centuries and another on the sixteenth (Paris, Picard, 1912, 1914).

Under the general title *Les Origines de la Réforme*, P. Imbart de la Tour has followed the volumes on *La France Moderne* and *L'Église Catholique*, by *L'Évangélisme, 1521–1538, Étude sur la Réforme Française avant Calvin* (Paris, Hachette, 1914). Local phases of the reformation in France are the subject of volumes by H. Patry on *Les Débuts de la Réforme Protestante en Guyenne, 1523–1559* (Paris, Fischbacher, 1913, pp. xlii, 300); by C. Oursel, entitled *Notes pour servir à l'Histoire de la Réforme en Normandie au Temps de François Ier* (Caen, Delesques, 1913, pp. 156); and by V. Chareton on *La Réforme et les Guerres Civiles en Vivarais, 1544–1632* (Paris, Fischbacher, 1913, pp. xii, 430).

The Société d'Histoire de France has recently issued two volumes dealing with the period of Mazarin: Henri Courteault's edition of the *Journal de Jean Vallier, Maître d'Hotel du Roi, 1648–1657*; and the second volume (1654–1659) of P. Marichal's edition of the *Mémoires du Maréchal de Turenne* (Paris, Renouard, 1913, 1914). Another volume of memoirs of the period is Count G. de Lhomel's edition of *Les Relations d'Antoine de Lumbres* (vol. II., 1656–1660, Paris, Plon, 1912). H. Coville has made an *Étude sur Mazarin et ses Démêlés avec le Pape Innocent X., 1644–1648* (Paris, Champion, 1914, pp. vii, 197); and L. M. Kotowitsch has published a thesis on *Die Staatstheorien im Zeitalter der Fronde, 1648–1652* (Aarau, Sauerlander, 1913, pp. xv, 134). An exhaustive thesis on *Les Dernières Années de Turenne, 1660–1675* (Paris, Calmann-Lévy, 1914, pp. xxxix, 608) is by C. G. Picavet.

In the *Collection de Documents Inédits sur l'Histoire Économique de la Révolution Française*, A. Rebillon, professor in the Lycée of Rennes, has published an elaborate compilation, with an excellent and comprehensive introduction, on *La Situation Économique du Clergé à la Veille de la Révolution dans les Districts de Rennes, de Fougères, et de Vitré* (Paris, Leroux, 1913, pp. ccxxix, 780). A carefully prepared map shows the percentage of real property in each commune belonging to the Church—only four exceeded twenty per cent., and only eight more exceeded ten per cent. There are also excellent introductions with illustrative charts in L. Schwab, *Documents relatifs à la Vente des Biens Nationaux, District de Remiremont (Vosges)*, and in G. Lefebvre, *Documents relatifs à l'Histoire des Subsistances dans le District de Bergues (Nord) pendant la Révolution*, tome I., which have recently been received, along with the third volume of E. Bridrey, *Cahiers de Doléances du Bailliage de Cotentin*, in the same series.

In *Rapports des Agents du Ministre de l'Intérieur dans les Départements, 1793—An II.* (tome I., Paris, Leroux, 1913, pp. xliv, 533), Pierre Caron has supplemented Professor Aulard's monumental publication of the correspondence of the deputies on mission under the Convention by publishing the reports to the minister of the interior of three sets of his executive agents sent out in 1793. The correspondence belongs mainly to the summer of 1793 and is most important as evidence of the state of public sentiment. The publication will be as complete as possible for the three sets of agents concerned, but has no relation to other national agents even of the same ministry. The volume is published in the *Collection de Documents Inédits sur l'Histoire de France*, in which series there has also just appeared the third volume of A. Debidour's *Recueil des Actes du Directoire Exécutif*, for the period July 4–October 6, 1796.

Professor Fournier has used the recent literature and continued his own researches in thoroughly revising his well-known *Napoleon I.: eine Biographie* (3 vols., Vienna, Tempsky, 1914) for the third edition. Frédéric Masson deals with the year 1815 in the eleventh volume of *Napoléon et sa Famille* (Paris, Ollendorff, 1914) and expects to issue the twelfth and final volume shortly. *Napoléon et les Grand Généraux de la Révolution et de l'Empire* (Paris, Fontemoing, 1914) is a study in the art of war by Count Lort de Sérignan. Max Grandwald has used the accounts by Jewish participants and observers in *Die Feldzüge Napoleons* (Vienna, Brunmüller, 1914, pp. viii, 310). F. J. MacCunnan has compiled a volume on *The Contemporary English View of Napoleon* (London, Bell, 1914, pp. viii, 311). The novelist Jehan d'Ivray has undertaken serious history in *Bonaparte et l'Égypte* (Paris, Lemerre, 1914). E. Welwert of the national archives has used the reports of Beugnot to Louis XVIII. in *Napoléon et la Police sous la Première Restauration* (Paris, Roger and Chernoviz, 1913). H. Conrad has arranged in chronological order the materials from the various St.

Helena diaries in *Napoleons Leben auf St. Helena, 1815–1821* (Stuttgart, Lutz, 1914).

The section for modern and contemporary history of the Committee on Historical and Scientific Works, under the ministry of public instruction, has begun the publication of a series of *Notices, Inventaires, et Documents*. The first volume contains *Documents sur l'Histoire Religieuse de la France pendant la Restauration, 1814–1830* (Paris, Rieder, 1913, pp. 271) calendared from the archives of the departments of the Bouches-du-Rhone and the Doubs by their respective archivists. The second volume contains *La Statistique Agricole de 1814* (*ibid.*, 1914, pp. xx, 579) reported by the archivists of each department in which the documents could be found.

M. Louis Halphen has recently published an excellent study, *L'Histoire en France depuis Cent Ans* (Armand Colin), in which he analyzes the reviving interest in history that followed the Restoration, and describes the work which the French government has done in publishing manuscripts, and the reorganization of history in the universities.

Volumes VIII. and IX. of *Les Origines Diplomatiques de la Guerre de 1870–1871, Recueil de Documents publié par le Ministère des Affaires Étrangères* (Paris, Ficker, 1914, pp. 487, 382) deal with the antecedents of the Seven Weeks' War, from March 16 to June 1, 1866. The main interest attaches to the correspondence of Benedetti from Berlin and in a less degree to the letters of Grammont from Vienna and of Malaret from Florence. The letters of the ministers at the lesser German capitals often furnish interesting side-lights.

The seventeenth and final volume of M. Ollivier's *L'Empire Libéral* is to be published shortly. Though written some fifteen or more years ago, M. Ollivier was in the midst of revising it when he died, and it still lacks a closing chapter on Sedan.

Among the patriotism-makers, published by the militarist agitators on the eve of the present war, were Captain Ledent's *Toutes les Victoires Françaises, 365 Jours, 797 Victoires, Pas un Jour sans Victoires* (Paris, Berger-Levrault, 1914); C. Malo's *Souvenirs Héroïques de l'Armée Française* (Paris, Hachette, 1914, pp. 380); and the popular, illustrated series of *Les Grands Hommes de Guerre* (Paris, Chapelot) with volumes on *Napoléon* by Lt.-Col. Colin, *Murat* by A. de Tarlé, *Davout* by R. Peyronnet, *Ney* by R. Andriot, *Masséna* by E. Gachot, *Kléber* by Lt.-Col. Richard, and *Bugeaud* by A. de Penennrun.

Toward the close of 1913, E. d'Hauterive brought to the attention of the management of the French national archives the present condition of the documents which had been used by Professor Aulard in his *Recueil des Actes du Comité de Salut Public*. Professor Aulard promptly responded with an attack upon the management of the archives for the destruction of certain classes of documents without consulting the

archives commission of which he is chairman. Both complaints were investigated. It was found that the destruction of documents had been done as a matter of normal routine. The procedure and the documents destroyed are described by C. V. Langlois, "Les Suppressions de Papiers Inutiles aux Archives Nationales en 1913" (*Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, January). In the other case, the report was practically a condemnation of Professor Aulard though it was framed in the most conciliatory fashion. The affair has caused a renewal of the attacks upon Aulard's historical method and upon his scholarship which have been made intermittently during the past half dozen years. One of the most serious of these assaults is Laurentie, "Le Cas de M. Aulard, les Aventures d'un Historien Officiel" (*Correspondant*, March 10). The various French historical reviews have each given more or less space to the affair.

In the series *Les Vieilles Provinces de France*, recent issues are *Franche-Comté*, by L. Febvre; *Corse*, by L. Villat; and *Poitou*, by P. Boissonnade (Paris, Boivin, 1912–1914). .The *Histoire de Bretagne* by A. de la Borderie and Barth-Socquet has been completed with the sixth volume (Rennes, Plihon and Hommay, 1914, pp. 563), which contains an index to the whole work. A. Oheix has published *Essais sur les Sénéchaux de Bretagne des Origines au XIV^e^ Siècle* (Paris, Fontemoing, 1913). Four volumes on *La Vie Urbaine de Douai au Moyen Âge* (Paris, Picard, 1914) are by G. Espinas.

In addition to brief articles on the history of Brittany, the *Annales de Bretagne* is publishing three important series of articles: S. Canal, *Les Origines de l'Intendance de Bretagne*; F. Quessette, *L'Administration Financière des États de Bretagne de 1689 à 1715*; and E. Sevestre, *Le Clergé Breton en 1801*.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: A. Héron de Villefosse, *Les Agents du Recensement dans les Trois Gaules* (Mémoires de la Société Nationale des Antiquaires de France, LXXIII.); J. Flach, *La Normandie était-elle un Grand Fief de la Couronne avant le XII^e^ Siècle?* (Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Sciences Morales et Politiques, February); Hilda Johnstone, *The County of Ponthieu, 1279–1307* (English Historical Review, July); P. Viard, *L'Évolution de la Dime Ecclésiastique en France aux XIV^e^ et XV^e^ Siècles* (Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung, Kanonistische Abteilung, XXXIV. 3); H. Sée, *La Question de la Vaine Pâture en France à la Fin de l' Ancien Régime* (Revue d'Histoire Économique et Sociale, VII. 1); M. Marion, *L'Imposition des ci-devant Privilégiés en 1789* (Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Sciences Morales et Politiques, February); C. Ballot, *La Politique Extérieure du Directoire d'après des Ouvrages Récents* (Revue d'Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine, March); A. Aulard, *Thiers, Historien de la Révolution Française* (La Révolution Française, June, July); A. Gourvitch, *Le Mouvement pour la Réforme Électorale, 1838–1841*,

I. (La Révolution de 1848, May); C. Benoist, *L'Homme de 1848* (Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Sciences Morales et Politiques, November, March); E. Ollivier, *La Fin de l'Empire* (Revue des Deux Mondes, June 15, July 1); Lieut. Peyronnet, *Ceux qui ont étudié Napoléon* (Journal des Sciences Militaires, April 11, 18, May 2, 9, 16, July 4, 11); A. Georges-Berthier, *L'Histoire des Sciences en France, à propos de la Suppression d'une Chaire* (Revue de Synthèse Historique, April).

ITALY, SPAIN, AND PORTUGAL

Father Fedele Savio, S.J., is practically making a beginning of an *Italia Sacra* of the completest and most scholarly kind, by the publication of a thick volume on the bishops of Milan, *Gli Antichi Vescovi d'Italia dalle Origini al 1300 descritti per Regioni: la Lombardia*, parte I., *Milano* (Florence, Libreria Editrice Fiorentina, 1913, pp. xx, 974). Not only are lists and lives of bishops presented, but also ten learned dissertations on appropriate themes. The volume for the rest of Lombardy is in press.

The first volume of *Il Regesto di Farfa*, by Gregorio di Catino, edited by I. Georgi and Count U. Balzani, has been issued as the first number of the *Biblioteca della R. Società Romana di Storia Patria* (Rome, Loescher, 1914). The publication of this compilation will require four volumes. In the series *Regesta Chartarum Italiae*, the eleventh and twelfth numbers are the first volume of G. Zucchetti's edition of the *Liber Largitorius vel Notarius Monasterii Pharphensis*; and the first volume of the *Regestum Mantuanum* edited by P. Torelli (Rome, Loescher, 1913–1914). The sixth and seventh numbers of P. Sella's *Corpus Statutorum Italicorum* are the first volume of the *Statuti del Lago Maggiore e della Val d'Ossola*, edited by E. Anderloni and P. Sella, and the first volume of the *Statuti di Valdelsa*, edited by A. Latini (*ibid.*, 1914). Other recent documentary publications are *Lo Statuto della Corporazione dei Fabbri del 1244* (Modena, 1914), edited by Franchini; the first volume of *Documenti delle Relazioni tra Carlo I. d'Angiò e la Toscana* (Florence, 1914), edited by S. Terlizzi; the fourth volume (1567–1620) of the *Codex Diplomaticus Ord. S. Augustini Papiae* (Pavia, 1913); and *Le Pergamene di Barletta dell' Archivio Capitolare, 897–1285* (Trani, Vecchi, 1914), edited by F. Nitti di Vito, as the eighth volume of the *Codice Diplomatico Barese*.

The history of Norman administrative measures has received a substantial addition in Miss Evelyn Jamison's *The Norman Administration of Apulia and Capua, more especially Roger II. and William I., 1127–1166*, volume VI. of the *Papers* of the British School at Rome. The work is done with adequate scholarship and insight.

J. Pacheu's *Jacopone de Todi, Frère Mineur Franciscain, 1230–1306, Auteur Présumé du Stabat Mater* (Paris, Tralin, 1914); A. d'Ancona's *Jacopone da Todi, il Giullare di Dio del Secolo XIII.* (Todi, Atanòr,

1914, pp. 116) and Professor B. Brugnoli's critical edition of *Le Satire di Jacopone da Todi* (Florence, Olschki, 1914, pp. cxl, 428) will serve to keep green the memory of that thirteenth-century worthy. Biographies of medieval Italian churchmen include W. Franke's *Romuald von Camaldoli und seine Reformtätigkeit zur Zeit Ottos III.* (Berlin, Ebering, 1913, pp. vii, 255); Abbé R. Morçay's *Saint Antonin, Fondateur du Couvent de Saint-Marc, Archevêque de Florence, 1389–1459* (Paris, Gabalda, 1914, pp. xxxii, 504); and J. Schnitzer's *Savonarola im Streite mit seinem Orden und mit seinem Kloster* (Munich, Leemann, 1914).

A. Pingaud is the author of two volumes on *Bonaparte, Président de la République Italienne* (Paris, Perrin, 1914, pp. xxix, 491; 535). Bonaparte's minister of finance in Italy from 1802 to 1814 is the subject of a biographical sketch, *Il Ministro Prina, Cento Anni dopo la sua Morte*, by Dr. L. Ratti (Milan, 1914, pp. 73). The papal side of Napoleon's Italian policy receives new light from E. Ruck's *Die Sendung des Kardinals de Bayane nach Paris, 1807–1808, eine Episode aus der Politik Napoleons I. und Pius VII.* (Heidelberg, 1913).

The Italian National Society for the History of the Risorgimento, after publishing seven volumes of the review *Il Risorgimento Italiano*, has changed the title of its official organ to *Rassegna Storica del Risorgimento* (Città di Castello, S. Lapi). Its editor is Professor Giuseppe Gallavresi of Milan. The former review, *Il Risorgimento Italiano* (Turin, Bocca), has been taken over by Senator T. Palamenghi-Crispi.

In the fourth edition (Milan, 1914), P. Orsi's *L'Italia Moderna* is continued to 1913. A similar work is M. Rosi's *Storia Contemporanea d'Italia dalle Origini del Risorgimento ai Giorni Nostri* (Turin, 1914, pp. viii, 464). The years, 1891–1894, are covered in the sixth volume of P. Vigo's *Annali d'Italia, Storia degli ultimi Trent' Anni del Secolo XIX.* (Milan, 1913). The years 1899–1909 are the *Dieci Anni di Vita Italiana* described by F. Papafava (2 vols., Bari, Laterza, 1913, pp. xvi, 402; 430). The problem of *L'Italia nell' Egeo* (Rome, Provenzani, 1913, pp. 290) has been discussed by G. De Frenzi.

In *Sevilla en el Siglo XIII.* (Madrid, Torres, 1913, pp. 255, cccxxxviii), A. Ballesteros has appended to his text a wealth of documents.

L'Astronomie Nautique au Portugal à l'Époque des Grandes Découvertes (Bern, M. Drechsel, 1912, pp. 285, reviewed by R. Sciama, *Revue des Études Juives*, January) is a notable study by J. Bensaude, based upon three Portuguese texts discovered in a hitherto overlooked incunabulum in the Royal Library at Munich. He apparently proves the use of the astrolabe at much earlier dates than previously supposed. He explains how John II. of Portugal secured Brazil as well as the route to the Indies in the Bull of Demarcation and why he neglected Columbus and his discoveries. An appendix gives a chronological list of geographical discoveries from 1290 to 1529.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: W. R. Thayer, *Risorgimento History* (The Nation, July 2); G. Capasso, *Dandolo, Morosini, Manara, 1848–1849* (Nuova Antologia, May 16); M. Riccio, *Francesco Crispi, la Sardegna e la Sicilia* (*ibid.*, June 16); E. Re, *Archivi Inglesi e Storia Italiana* (Archivio Storico Italiano, 1913); G. Cirot, *Florian de Ocampo, Chroniste de Charles-Quint* (Bulletin Hispanique, XVI. 3); C. Cambronero, *La Reina Gobernadora, Crónicas Políticas de 1833 a 1840* (La España Moderna, May, June, July).

GERMANY, AUSTRIA, AND SWITZERLAND

Professor G. von Below discusses *Die Allgemeinen Fragen* in the first volume of *Der Deutsche Staat des Mittelalters, ein Grundriss der Deutschen Verfassungsgeschichte* (Leipzig, Quelle and Meyer, 1914, pp. xx, 387). In an article, *Landeshoheit und Niedergericht* (Deutsche Literaturzeitung, July 11), Professor von Below again attacks the opposing theories of Professor Seeliger which appear in the two theses reviewed in the article. These theses are *Das Tägliche Gericht, ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Niedergerichtsbarkeit im Mittelalter* (Breslau, Marcus, 1913, pp. 138) by Dr. K. Weimann, and *Niedere Gerichtsbarkeit und Grafengewalt im Badischen Linzgau während des ausgehenden Mittelalters* (*ibid.*, 1913, pp. x, 117). Another constitutional problem is investigated in von Dungern's *War Deutschland ein Wahlreich?* (Liepzig, Meiner, 1913) in which it is contended that the electoral choice was virtually limited by a well-understood rule of succession.

R. Scholz has published a volume of comment and a volume of texts of *Unbekannte Kirchenpolitische Streitschriften aus der Zeit Ludwigs des Bayern* in the *Bibliothek des Königlich Preussischen Historischen Instituts in Rom* (Rome, 1913, 1914). R. Moeller has a volume on *Ludwig der Bayer und die Kurie im Kampf um das Reich* (Berlin, Ebering, 1914).

Dr. J. Schairer has used Augsburg sources in studying *Das Religiöse Volksleben am Ausgang des Mittelalters* (Leipzig, Teubner, 1914, pp. viii, 136) and Dr. M. Haussler has given account of the Dominican, *Felix Fabri aus Ulm und seine Stellung zum Geistigen Leben seiner Zeit* (*ibid.*, 1914, pp. vii, 119). Both theses are published in Professor Goetz's series of *Beiträge*. Dr. Paul Roth has an interesting thesis on the occasional sheets of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries as forerunners of the modern newspaper, *Die Neuen Zeitungen in Deutschland im 15. und 16. Jahrhundert* (*ibid.*, 1914, pp. vi, 86, reviewed by M. Spahn, *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, July 18, 25).

Georg Mentz has published a useful manual on *Deutsche Geschichte im Zeitalter der Reformation, der Gegenreformation und des Dreissigjährigen Krieges, 1493–1648* (Tübingen, Mohr, 1913, pp. viii, 479).

The newest issue in Dr. Aloys Meister's *Grundriss der Geschichtswissenschaft*, and a manual for which there is extensive need on the part of American teachers, is *Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte vom 15. Jahrhundert bis zur Gegenwart*, by Dr. Fritz Hartung of Halle (Leipzig, Teubner, pp. 174). The statements are brief, but are accompanied with a wealth of references to monographs.

In L. von Pastor's *Erläuterungen und Ergänzungen zu Janssens Geschichte des Deutschen Volkes*, the third part of the ninth volume is G. Schuhmann's *Die Berner Ketzertragödie im Lichte der Neueren Forschung und Kritik*; and the first and second parts of the tenth volume are J. B. Götz's *Die Religiöse Bewegung in der Oberpfalz von 1520 bis 1560, auf Grund Archivalischer Forschungen* (Freiburg i. B., Herder, 1912–1914).

Recent biographical studies belonging to the Reformation period include A. Brandt, *Johann Ecks Predigertätigkeit an U. L. Frau zu Ingolstadt, 1525–1542* (Münster, Aschendorff, 1914); G. Anrich, *Martin Bucer* (Strassburg, Trübner, 1914, pp. v, 147); E. Giran, *Sebastian Castellion et la Réforme Calviniste* (Paris, Hachette, 1914); and Professor E. Baehler, *Nikolaus Zurkinden von Bern, 1506–1588, ein Vertreter der Toleranz* (Zürich, Beer, 1912, pp. 199).

Dr. Julius Glücklich of the Bohemian University of Prague has published under the auspices of the Francis Joseph Academy of Arts and Sciences (Prague, 1908–1912) the very valuable correspondence and papers of Václav Budovec of Budova, 1580–1619. Václav Budovec was the maker of the famous Letter of Majesty and the leader of the movement for unity among the Protestants of Bohemia before the outbreak of the Thirty Years' War. The correspondence is in Latin, Bohemian, and German, and includes letters to and from Beza, Mornay du Plessis, and others.

R. Koser has issued the initial volume of a *Geschichte der Brandenburgisch-Preussischen Politik* (Stuttgart, Cotta, 1914). In Schuster's *Geschichte des Preussischen Hofes*, E. Bleich has written the volume on *Der Hof des Königs Friedrich Wilhelm II. und Friedrich Wilhelm III.* (Berlin, Voss, 1914). For Berlin and the political and intellectual situation in the time of Frederick William II. there is much useful material in Joseph Hay's *Staat, Volk, und Weltbürgertum in der Berlinischen Monatschrift von Friedrich Gedike und Johann Erich Biester, 1783–1796* (Berlin, Haude and Spener, 1913, pp. 83).

The period since Waterloo is covered in the second volume of Freiherr von der Goltz's *Kriegsgeschichte Deutschlands im Neunzehnten Jahrhundert* (Berlin, Bondi, 1914, pp. xxxi, 654). About half the volume relates to the war of 1870. *Le Service d'État-Major en Campagne, les Quartiers-Généraux et les État-Majors Allemands en 1870* (Paris, Chapelot, 1914) is a thorough study by Colonel Tourloge.

Dr. Jan Heidler of the Bohemian University of Prague has written an important monograph entitled: *Antonin Springer a Česká Politika v Letech 1848–1850* (Prague, 1914). This study is founded on hitherto unpublished documents, for the most part memoirs and letters of such leaders in Bohemian and Austrian politics as Palacký, Rieger, Pinkas, and Springer during the years when Springer still believed in federalism in contrast to the point of view he assumed later in his *Geschichte Oesterreichs seit dem Wiener Frieden* (2 vols., Leipzig, 1863–1865).

Prince von Bülow contributed a notable article on "Deutsche Politik" to the first volume of *Deutschland unter Kaiser Wilhelm II.* (Berlin, Hobbing, 1914, pp. 1–136, reviewed by P. Hiltebrandt, *Deutsche Rundschau*, May; French translation by M. Herbette, Paris, Charles-Lavauzelle, 1914). *Die Deutsche Innere Politik unter Kaiser Wilhelm II.* (Stuttgart, Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1913, pp. ix, 342) by W. von Massow, and Captain B. Serrigny's *L'Évolution de l'Empire Allemand de 1871 jusqu'à nos Jours* (Paris, Perrin, 1913, pp. vi, 331) are additional volumes on the reign of the present kaiser.

The judgments of history are no doubt sure, but the judgments of historians are subject to revision, sometimes deadly in its promptness, by new events. That the timeliness of Professor R. Charmatz, *Geschichte der Auswärtigen Politik Oesterreichs im 19. Jahrhundert* (vol. II., 1848–1908, Leipzig, Teubner, 1914, pp. vi, 136), in the series *Aus Natur und Geisteswelt*, was quite unpremeditated is all too clear from the present absurdity of the "Schlusswort", which was good reading three months ago.

The *Oesterreichische Rundschau* published an illustrated supplement of over a hundred pages in honor of the fiftieth birthday of *Erzherzog Franz Ferdinand, Unser Thronfolger.*

P. Dengel has published *Das Oesterreichische Historische Institut in Rom, 1901–1913* (Vienna, Herder, 1914, pp. 99) in honor of the sixtieth birthday of Ludwig von Pastor. The pamphlet contains a bibliography of the writings of Pastor and of the publications of the Austrian Historical Institute at Rome during the twelve years of Pastor's directorship.

The following recent volumes on Austrian local history are of interest: von Thallóczy, *Studien zur Geschichte Bosniens und Serbiens im Mittelalter* (Munich, Duncker and Humblot, 1914); H. Grossmann, *Oesterreichs Handelspolitik mit Bezug auf Galizien in der Reformperiode, 1772–1790* (Vienna, Konegen, 1914); V. Zagarski, *François Racki et la Renaissance Scientifique et Politique de la Croatie, 1828–1894* (Paris, Hachette, 1913); and V. Brunelli, *Storia della Città di Zara dai Tempi più rimoti fino al 1815, compilata sulle Fonti* (vol. I., Venice, 1914).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: E. Eichmann, *Die Exkommunikation Philipps von Schwaben* (Historisches Jahrbuch, XXXV. 2); G. von Below, *Handwerk und Hofrecht, eine Entgegnung* (Vierteljahr-

schrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte, XII. 1); P. Kalkoff, *Die Bulle "Exsurge"* (Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, XXXV. 2); J. Gottschick *Luthers Theologie* (Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche, XXIV., Ergänzungsheft I.); O. Winckelmann, *Ueber die ältesten Armenordnungen der Reformationszeit, 1522–1525* (Historische Vierteljahrschrift, XXV. 2); A. Meister, *Die Wirkung des Wirtschaftlichen Kampfes zwischen Frankreich und England, 1791–1813, auf Westfalen* (Zeitschrift für Vaterlandische Geschichte und Altertumskunde Westfalens, LXXI.); H. Delbrück, *Neues über 1813* (Preussische Jahrbücher, July); R. Fester, *Die Genesis der Emser Depesche*, I., II., III. (Deutsche Rundschau, June, July, August); A. Haas, *Das Moderne Zeitungswesen in Deutschland* (Volkswirtschaftliche Zeitfragen, XXXVI. 1); F. Curschmann, *Die Entwicklung der Historisch-Geographischen Forschung in Deutschland durch Zwei Jahrhunderte*, I. (Archiv für Kulturgeschichte, XII. 2); C. Ballod, *Deutsche Volksernährung im Kriege* (Preussische Jahrbücher, July); E. Ott, *Das Eindringen des Kanonischen Rechts, seine Lehre und Wissenschaftliche Pflege in Böhmen und Mähren während des Mittelalters* (Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung, Kanonistische Abteilung, XXXIV. 3); F. Ilwof, *Der ständische Landtag des Herzogtums Steiermark unter Maria Theresia und ihren Söhnen* (Archiv für Oesterreichische Geschichte, CIV. 1); E. Chapuisat, *Comment Genève devint Ville Suisse* (Revue de Paris, July 1).

NETHERLANDS AND BELGIUM

The latest issue in Professors Cramer and Pijper's *Bibliotheca Reformatoria Neerlandica* (the Hague, Nijhoff, pp. xi, 723) is part X., consisting of the writings of Dirk Philipsz., of date from 1564 to 1619.

In the *Nederlandsch Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis*, n. s., XI. 1, Mr. W. Mallinckrodt presents, in a biography of Sicco Tjaden of Groningen, a contribution of considerable value to the history of pietism.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: L. Van der Essen, *Le Progrès du Luthéranisme et du Calvinisme dans le Monde Commercial d'Anvers et l'Espionnage Politique du Marchand Philippe Dauxy, Agent secret de Marguerite de Parme, en 1566–1567* (Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte, XII. 1); E. Vlietinck, *Le Rapprochement Néerlando-Belge* (Revue de Droit International et de Législation Comparée, XVI. 3); F. Hoffmann, *Niederländisch-Ostindien im letzten Jahrhundert* (Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv, July).

NORTHERN AND EASTERN EUROPE

Lauritz Weibull has continued in *Historisk-Kritisk Metod och Nordisk Medeltidsforskning* (Lund, Gleerup, 1913, pp. 95) the discussion of the historical value of the saga-literature which he opened in his *Kritiska Undersökningar.*

An interesting discussion of the Cyril-Methodius question will be found in *Die Wahrheit über die Slavenapostel* (Tübingen, Mohr, 1913, pp. 127) by A. Brückner.

The third volume of L. Kulczycki's *Geschichte der Russischen Revolution* (Gotha, Perthes, 1914, pp. viii, 496), German translation from the original Polish, deals with the period 1886–1900.

In January appeared the first number of the monthly *Bulletin de l'Institut pour l'Étude de l'Europe Sud-Orientale*, edited by Professor N. Jorga, as the organ of the newly founded Institutul de Studii Sudosteuropene of Bucharest. Articles relating to the geography, archaeology, and history of Rumania and neighboring lands are printed in Rumanian, French, or German.

Le Siège de Constantinople en 1453 (Paris, Plon, 1914) is an exhaustive study by G. Schlumberger.

The Struggle for Scutari (*Turk, Slav, and Albanian*) by Miss M. Edith Durham (London, Longmans, 1914, pp. 320) belongs to the class called *mémoires pour servir*. The writer, occupied mostly with relief work in North Albania during the years of warfare, details the story of 1911 and 1912 with Albanian and anti-Montenegrin sympathies, in a narrative of extraordinary interest, filled with the horrors of warfare, and strongly marked by the sense of having played a highly important part in what went on.

The Austro-Hungarian ministry of foreign affairs has published a volume of *Diplomatische Aktenstücke* (Vienna, 1914) relating to Balkan affairs from August, 1912, to November, 1913. The first publication of the German general staff on the Balkan wars treats *Die Ereignisse auf dem Thrazischen Kriegsschauplatz bis zum Waffenstillstand* (Berlin, Mittler, 1914, pp. vi, 160, 6 maps). General Fitchev, the chief of the Bulgarian general staff during the Balkan wars, has prepared *La Guerre Turco-Bulgare d'après les Relations et Documents Officiels de l'État-Major Bulgare* (2 vols., Paris, Berger-Levrault, 1914). Other new publications on the Balkan wars are: G. Rémond and A. de Penennrun, *Sur les Lignes de Feu, le Carnet de Champ de Bataille du Colonel Djemal Bey, de Kirk-Kilissé à Tchataldja* (Paris, Chapelot, 1914); and M. Pickthall, *With the Turk in Wartime* (London, Dent, 1914).

Recent and present conditions and problems in the Turkish Empire are described and discussed in B. G. Baker, *The Passing of the Turkish Empire in Europe* (New York, 1913, pp. 309); G. Gaulis, *La Ruine d'un Empire: Abd-ul-Hamid, ses Amis et ses Peuples* (Paris, Colin, 1913, pp. xi, 359); Ali Vahbi Bey, *Pensées et Souvenirs de l'ex-Sultan Abdul Hamid* (Paris, Attinger, 1914); and V. Bérard, *La Révolution Turque* (Paris, Colin, 1913).

Recent books on Albania, its history, conditions, and problems, include F. Gibert, *Les Pays d'Albanie et leur Histoire* (Paris, Rosier,

1914); G. Louis-Jaray, *Au Jeune Royaume d'Albanie, ce qu'il a été, ce qu'il est* (Paris, Hachette, 1914); and S. Copčević, *Das Fürstentum Albanien, seine Vergangenheit, Ethnographischen Verhältnisse, Politische Lage und Aussichten für die Zukunft* (Berlin, Paetel, 1914, pp. 356).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: A. Bugge, *Der Untergang der Norwegischen Schiffahrt im Mittelalter* (Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte, XII. 1); R. Dmowski, *The Political Evolution of Poland*, III. (Russian Review, May); Z. Balycki, *The Revival of Political Thought in Poland* (*ibid.*); V. Dourdenevski, *Le Régime de la Presse en Russie et son Projet de Réforme* (Revue du Droit Public et de la Science Politique, April); B. E. Schmitt, *The Balkan Revolution* (Western Reserve University Bulletin, new series, XVII. 3); S. P. Phocas-Cosmetatos, *Le Relèvement Économique de la Grèce* (Revue de Paris, July 1).

AFRICA

Professor Stéphane Gsell's *Histoire Ancienne de l'Afrique du Nord* (Paris, Hachette), which promises to be a most complete and satisfactory general survey, will consist of six volumes, extending to the Arab conquest. The first, which has already appeared, covers the geographical setting, the stone age, the Phoenician settlement, and the rise of the Carthaginian empire.

Various phases of North African history and politics are described in G. Marcais, *Les Arabes en Berberie du XI^e^ au XIV^e^ Siècle* (Paris, Leroux, 1914, pp. 770); G. Esquer (editor), *Correspondance du Duc de Rovigo, Commandant en Chef de Corps d'Occupation d'Afrique, 1831–1833* (vol. I., Algiers, Jourdan, 1914, pp. vi, 694); E. Lopez Alarcon, *Melilla, 1909, Crónica de un Testigo* (Madrid, Alvarez, 1913, pp. 416); A. Servier, *Le Nationalisme Musulman en Égypte, en Tunisie, en Algérie* (Constantine, Boët, 1913); and G. Sarkissian, *Le Soudan Égyptien, Étude sur le Droit International Public* (Paris, Larose, 1913, pp. 150).

The literature relating to the Italian occupation of Tripoli includes C. Causa, *La Guerra Italo-Turca e la Conquista della Tripolitania* (Florence, Salani, 1913, pp. 842); R. d'Andrea, *La Conquista Libica* (Naples, Bideri, 1913, pp. xvi, 306); A. Dauzat, *L'Expansion Italienne* (Paris, Fasquelle, 1914, pp. 298); G. Sabotta, *Politica di Penetrazione in Africa, l'Islam e l'Italia* (Rome, Lux, 1913, pp. 147); W. K. McClure, *Italy in North Africa* (London, Constable, 1913, pp. 320); A. Malvezzi, *L'Italia e l'Islam in Libia* (Florence, Treves, 1913, pp. 270); and P. V. de Regny, *Libya Italica* (Milan, Hoepli, 1913, pp. 214).

On the French conquest of Morocco, there have appeared Hubert-Jacques, *Les Journées Sanglantes de Fez* (Paris, Chapelot, 1913); L. Capperon, *Au Secours de Fès* (Paris, Charles-Lavauzelle, 1913, pp. 246); Captain Guillaume, *Sur la Frontière Marocaine* (*ibid.*, pp. 244); Lieutenant Segonds, *La Chaouia et sa Pacification* (*ibid.*, pp. 144); Lieuten-

ant Kuntz, *Souvenirs de Campagne au Maroc* (*ibid.*, pp. 616); Captain Feline, *L'Artillerie au Maroc, Campagnes en Chaouia* (Paris, Berger-Levrault, 1912, pp. vii, 318); Lieutenant-Colonel Magnin, *Campagne de Tadla* (*ibid.*, pp. 80); Captain Cornet, *À la Conquête du Maroc Sud avec la Colonne Mangin* (Paris, Plon, 1914, pp. viii, 334); and L. Voinot, *Oudjda et Amalat.*

The French protectorate and work of administration in Morocco are described and discussed in P. Khorat, *Scènes de la Pacification Marocaine* (Paris, Perrin, 1914, pp. iv, 307); R. Bernard and C. Aymard, *L'Oeuvre Française au Maroc, Avril 1912–Septembre 1913* (Paris, Hachette, 1914, pp. x, 254); G. Lebre, *De l'Établissement du Protectorat de la France au Maroc et spécialement du Régime Foncier* (Paris, Pedone, 1914); G. Desroches, *Le Maroc, Hier, Aujourd'hui, Demain* (Paris, Flammarion, 1914); M. Revilliod, *L'Organisation Intérieure des Pays de Protectorat, son Application au Maroc* (Paris, Rousseau, 1913); and R. van Loo, *La Rénovation du Maroc* (Paris, Lebègue, 1913, pp. 220).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Sir H. H. Johnston, *A Survey of the Ethnography of Africa and the Former Racial and Tribal Migrations in that Continent* (Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland, July–December, 1913); C. Grilli, *Gli Esperimenti Coloniali nell' Africa Neolatina* (Rivista Internazionale di Scienze Sociali, December, January, February, March).

THE FAR EAST AND INDIA

A welcome addition to works of reference is *The China Year Book*, for 1914 (Dutton), containing in addition to articles on the history of the year, a "Who's Who" almost twice as large as that of the volume for 1913.

A document of much interest to the student of the opening up of Japan to western civilization is *The Life of Takano Nagahide*, by Osada Kenjiro, translated and edited by the late Dr. Daniel C. Greene of Tokyo, who has supplied a useful introduction. The importance of the life of Takano (1804–1850) consists in his relation to western learning as acquired through Dutch means long before Perry's visit, and in the valuable work he did, against warm opposition, in preparing the way toward the advent of new Japan. The translation appears in the *Transactions* of the Asiatic Society of Japan (XLI., part III.) for August, 1913.

The publication of the *Guerre Russo-Japonaise, 1904–1905*, prepared by the Russian general staff and translated by the French general staff, has reached the battle of Mukden, which is described in the first part of the fifth volume (Paris, Chapelot, 1913, pp. ix, 828, and atlas). The *Schlacht bei Mukden, 25 Februar bis 3 März 1905* (Berlin, Mittler, 1913, pp. vi, 118) is the latest publication of the German general staff regarding the same war. *Betrachtungen über den Russisch-Japanischen Krieg* is the third part of Freiherr von Freytag-Loringhoven's *Die Führung in*

den neuesten Kriegen, Operatives und Taktisches (Berlin, Mittler, 1913, pp. vi, 154). Commandant Janet has written an *Étude sur les Opérations du Groupe de l'Est à la Bataille de Chaho, le Commandement, la Cavalerie* (Paris, Chapelot, 1914, pp. 115). In *Les Derniers Jours du "Sebastopol" à Port Arthur* (Paris, Challamel, 1914, pp. 148), Commandant de Balincourt has published the notes of N. O. von Essen, the commander of the ship.

Recent events in China are narrated and discussed in J. Rodes, *Dix Ans de Politique Chinoise, le Céleste Empire avant la Révolution* (Paris, Alcan, 1914); F. Farjenel, *À Travers la Révolution Chinoise* (Paris, Plon, 1914, pp. vi, 402); and A. Maybon, *La République Chinoise* (Paris, Colin, 1914, pp. xix, 268).

A. Leclère has written an *Histoire du Cambodge depuis le Premier Siècle de Notre Ère* (Paris, Geuthner, 1913, pp. xii, 547).

The unpublished history of Fernão de Queiroz has been the principal source used by P. E. Pierio in his *Ceylon: the Portuguese Era*, a history of the island from 1505 to 1658, published at Colombo by the Colombo Apothecaries' Company.

War and Sport in India, 1802–1806: an Officer's Diary (Heath, Cranton and Ouseley) throws some light on the campaigns under General Lake.

AMERICA

GENERAL ITEMS

The European work of the Department of Historical Research in the Carnegie Institution of Washington has been seriously affected by the war. Professor W. I. Hull, after one month's work in the Dutch archives, returned to the United States. Professor Golder has however been able to continue his work in the archives of Petrograd (St. Petersburg), and will soon make a beginning in those of Moscow. Mr. Leland remained in Paris till the early days of September, conducting under great difficulties his own work and that of others, but has now been obliged to return to the United States. The outbreak of war, by its effects on the supply of suitable paper, delayed for a time the large undertaking in photographic reproduction which was to be a part of Mr. F. S. Philbrick's summer campaign in Seville, but it has since gone forward, and he has made large progress in the Audiencias section of the Archives of the Indies. Mr. R. R. Hill's volume on the Papeles de Cuba is nearly completed in manuscript. Professor Faust's *Guide to the Materials for American History in Swiss and Austrian Archives* is finished, and will soon go to the printer. In the work on the *Atlas of the Historical Geography of the United States*, the Department will have for the next four months the assistance of Professor R. H. Whitbeck of the University of Wisconsin. From the beginning of November to the beginning of May it will, as already announced, have the great ben-

efit of the presence of Admiral Mahan as a "research associate" of the Institution. The second volume of Professor Charles M. Andrews's *Guide to the Materials for American History, to 1783, in the Public Record Office* has been published, completing a notable and laborious service on his part to the cause of colonial history, and the series of the Department's London guides.

The first two volumes of the *Cyclopedia of American Government*, edited by Professors McLaughlin and Hart, have come from the press (Appleton), the third is on the point of appearing.

With a view apparently to the Congress of Americanists which had been expected to be held in Washington, October 5–10, Professor Henri Cordier of Paris has issued a volume entitled *Mélanges Américains* (Paris, Maisonneuve) comprising twenty-eight papers of various value in the field of American studies, with special reference to archaeology and ethnography.

Professor Albert H. Sanford of the State Normal School, La Crosse, Wisconsin, has brought out through A. J. Nystrom and Company a set of thirty-two *American History Maps*, illustrating the more important phases of American history from the beginning of exploration to the present time. The maps contain numerous special features.

Among the recent accessions of the Manuscripts Division of the Library of Congress are: the papers of Edmund Roberts, 1829–1836, a body of manuscripts pertaining to the early diplomatic history of the United States in the Orient, and the negotiation of treaties with the United States in that region; miscellaneous papers of Judge Alfred Roman, of Louisiana, being war telegrams and correspondence of General P. G. T. Beauregard, 1861–1890; various miscellaneous accounts, bills, and memoranda of expenses of the Randolph family, 1760–1860. Additional transcripts from documents in the Public Record Office and British Museum, London, have been received; and also transcripts from archives in Paris, in Seville, and in St. Petersburg.

Professor J. A. Woodburn has brought out a revised and enlarged edition of his *Political Parties and Party Problems in the United States* (Putnam).

The sixth edition of *The Tariff History of the United States*, by Professor F. W. Taussig, has come from G. P. Putnam's Sons (pp. xi, 465). Though the entire text has suffered some changes, the edition gains additional value from a chapter of forty pages on the tariff of 1913, which recounts briefly the events preceding the enactment of this tariff, the chief features of the tariff itself, and the probable effects, dwelling specially on the exaggerated importance placed upon the changes involved, the result, he points out, of the purely political prominence which the tariff question has attained in this country.

Mr. Oscar G. T. Sonneck, chief of the Division of Music in the Library of Congress, has followed up his report of 1909 on the history of

the Star Spangled Banner, Hail Columbia, America, and Yankee Doodle by a more special treatment (pp. 115, and 25 plates) of the history of the first of these, revised and enlarged from the previous report, and dealing with both the history of the air and that of the words.

The much-belated December number of the *Magazine of History* contains a biographical sketch, by Mary Boudinot Church, of Elias Boudinot, the Cherokee (1800?–1839), a letter written by Captain C. H. Heyer from Mexico in January, 1848, and a part of a letter from General Zachary Taylor to Jefferson Davis, February 16, 1848. The January number contains extracts from the diary of a British officer in Boston in 1775, hitherto unpublished.

ITEMS ARRANGED IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER

The Peabody Museum of Harvard University has recently published, as no. 3 of volume V. of its *Memoirs*, an account of the Museum expedition of 1909–1910, by Alfred M. Tozzer, entitled *A Preliminary Study of the Pre-Historic Ruins of Nakum, Guatemala.*

Mr. William H. Babcock's *Early Norse Visits to North America*, a Smithsonian publication (no. 2138, pp. 213), is a valuable sifting of traditions and probabilities, with numerous maps and charts.

Dr. F. Oppliger presented as his thesis at the University of Bern, *Geschichte der Kolonialen Demarkation zwischen Spanien und Portugal, 1493–1750* (Biel, Schuler, 1913, pp. 68).

The Exodus of the Loyalists from Penobscot to Passamaquoddy, one of Professor Wilbur H. Siebert's excellent studies of the Loyalists, constitutes the April number of the *Ohio State University Bulletin* (vol. XVIII., no. 26, pp. 43).

Imperialistische und Pazifistische Strömungen in den Politik der Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika, 1776–1815 (Heidelberg, Winter, 1914) is the title of a thesis by Dr. Gertrud Philippi, published as number 45 of the *Heidelberger Abhandlungen.*

Mr. Warren K. Moorehead of Phillips Andover Academy, a member of the Board of Indian Commissioners, expects to issue in the winter *The Indian: a History, 1800–1914*, in which will be presented an historical narrative of Indian events within the period named, and an account of the present condition of the American Indian. After the finishing of this book, Mr. Moorehead expects to prepare other volumes going backward into the earlier periods of Indian history.

The third number of the *Osteuropäische Forschungen* is *Die Russisch-Amerikanische Handels-Kompagnie bis 1825* by Dr. H. Pilder (Berlin, Göschen, 1914).

Claims as a Cause of the Mexican War, by Dr. Clayton C. Kohl, has been brought out as *New York University Series of Graduate School*

Studies, no. 2 (New York, the University, pp. viii, 96). It is in effect a comprehensive history of the negotiations between the United States and Mexico between 1829 and 1848, with especial attention to the place which the claims of the United States against Mexico occupied in the policies of the several administrations and the extent to which they gave rise to war. The author reaches the conclusion that Mexico's one great grievance was the supposed desire of the United States for territory, while the only fundamental and logical grievance which the United States had against Mexico resided in the claims and that they constituted a just grievance. In addition to the mass of official and other publications relating to the subject, the author has made use to some extent of manuscript sources, such as the Jackson and Van Buren papers, Polk's Diary (since published), and manuscripts in the Department of State. Brief statements of the claims as drawn up in July, 1836, and July, 1837, are appended, as is also a bibliography.

The War with Mexico, 1846–1848, "a select bibliography *on* [*sic*] the causes, conduct, and the political aspect of the war, together with a select list of books and other printed material on the resources, economic conditions, politics, and government of the Republic of Mexico, and the characteristics of the Mexican people, with annotations and an index", has been brought out in Washington (*Professional Memoirs*, Washington Barracks). The compiler is H. E. Haferkorn.

The Chicago Historical Society has published an address on *The Lincoln-Douglas Debates* delivered before the society by Mr. Horace White, who attended most of the debates as a journalist, and has many interesting things to report.

The Navy Department has brought out volume XXVI. (pp. xvii, 915), of the *Official Records of the Union and Confederate Navies in the War of the Rebellion*, edited by Mr. Charles W. Stewart of the department. It consists of material relating to the naval forces on Western waters from March 1 to December 31, 1864.

It is announced that George W. Jacobs and Company will issue this fall a new biography of General Grant, by Spencer Adam.

Recollections of a Maryland Confederate Soldier and Staff Officer under Johnston, Jackson, and Lee, by McHenry Howard, is from the press of Williams and Wilkins Company.

Confederate Wizards of the Saddle: being Reminiscences and Observations of one who rode with Morgan, by Bennett H. Young, is from the press of Chapple Publishing Company.

It is understood that Mr. E. L. Sabin, in the preparation of *Kit Carson Days (1809–1868)*, just issued by McClurg, made extensive use of rare sources.

The Preliminary Diplomacy of the Spanish-American War, by Lewis A. Harding of Greensburg, Indiana (Indianapolis, the Hollenbeck Press),

is a pamphlet of 19 pages in which the important events indicated by its title are conveniently presented in compact form with suitable references.

Senate Document No. 719, 62 Cong., now in press, is a compilation of laws, agreements, executive orders, proclamations, etc., relating to the Indian inhabitants of the United States, negotiated and enacted from December 1, 1902 to 1913—virtually a third volume of Kappler's *Indian Laws and Treaties.*

Senate Document No. 522 of the 63d Congress, second session, is a history of the guaranty of bank deposits in Oklahoma, Texas, Kansas, Nebraska, and South Dakota, 1908–1914, by George H. Shibley.

LOCAL ITEMS, ARRANGED IN GEOGRAPHICAL ORDER

History of Hudson, New Hampshire, by G. W. Browne, has been published in Manchester by the Granite State Publishing Company.

In the May serial of the Massachusetts Historical Society's *Proceedings* Mr. Charles Francis Adams describes the diplomatic work of the Confederate commissioner, John Slidell, and the history of British governmental action on the Trent Affair, revising previous conclusions in the light of the copious and varied store of fresh manuscript material recently acquired by him in England. The title of the paper is "A Crisis in Downing Street". In the June serial Professor Justin H. Smith shows with careful judgment and in some detail the hostility of Great Britain toward and during our war with Mexico. A group of interesting letters from the presidents of the United States, from the private collection of Mr. Curtis Guild, is printed, and a considerable body of letters of Elbridge Gerry, mostly of 1813–1814, of small political importance but entertaining with respect to Washington life in the brief period of Gerry's vice-presidency.

G. P. Putnam's Sons have just issued *Nantucket: a History*, by R. A. Douglas-Lithgow.

The April issue of the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* contains a paper by Dr. Carlos E. Godfrey on the Organization of the Provisional Army of the United States in the anticipated War with France, 1798–1800, showing from the Washington and Hamilton collections in the Library of Congress that the provisional army was more than a paper organization. A roster of officers compiled from these sources is appended. The letters of Judge Henry Wynkoop, representative from Pennsylvania in the First Congress, are continued. There are also some letters of Gen. John Armstrong to Thomas Wharton, president of Pennsylvania, 1777, and some excerpts from the master's log of H. M. S. *Eagle*, Lord Howe's flagship, 1776–1777, from the original log in the Public Record Office and edited by William M. Mervine. In the July number of this magazine Horace W. Sellers contributes a biography and the Journal of Charles Willson Peale, artist and soldier of the Revolution attached to the Philadelphia militia.

Selections from the correspondence of Hugh Roberts, of Phliadelphia, with Benjamin Franklin while the latter was in Europe, are printed from the collection presented by the late Charles Morton Smith to the Historical Society of Pennsylvania. The contents also include articles on Nazareth, Pennsylvania, during the Revolution, 1775–1779, by John W. Jordan, Paintings by Gilbert Stuart not mentioned in Mason's *Life of Stuart*, listed by Mantle Fielding, and Instructions of Queen Anne to Col. Samuel Vetch for the organization of a Colonial Contingent for the Conquest of Canada, 1708, an imprint by William Bradford, 1709. On the side of genealogy, Thomas Allen Glenn contributes some Genealogical Gleanings of the Wilson or Willsons of Ulster, and W. M. Mervine presents an introductory note and the muster-rolls of the Men of Londonderry in 1630 and 1663.

Philadelphia in the Civil War, 1861–1865, by F. H. Taylor, has been privately printed in Philadelphia. The book is illustrated from contemporary prints and photographs and from drawings by the author.

The Pennsylvania Society of the Colonial Dames of America has brought out *Forges and Furnaces in the Province of Pennsylvania*.

In the *Nederlandsch Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis*, n. s., XI. 1, Dr. Eekhof continues his article on Jacobus Koelman, but his narrative of the Delaware episode contains almost nothing beyond what has already been known through the documents in the *Ecclesiastical Records of the State of New York*.

In the June number of the *Maryland Historical Magazine* are published Some Old English Letters, written in the early part of the eighteenth century, which have come down in the Taney family. The genealogical and editorial notes are by McHenry Howard. Other contributions include a letter, from the society's collections, of William E. Bartlett on the Bank Riot of 1835, and a memorial by Oswald Tilghman of Samuel Alexander Harrison, who wrote much on the history of Talbot County and the Eastern shore. The Vestry Proceedings of St. Ann's Parish, Annapolis, and Land Notes, 1634–1655, are continued.

The Tenth Annual Report of the Library Board of the Virginia State Library, 1912–1913, to which is appended the tenth annual report of the state librarian, has appeared. The report contains a summary description of the manuscript materials recently transferred to the library from the auditor's office, a catalogue of which has already appeared (see the April number of the REVIEW, p. 725). The library plans the publication of a list of the Virginia maps in the state library, with titles of the more important published maps of Virginia in the Library of Congress and in some of the departments of the federal government, and also a list of Virginia colonial soldiers.

The *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* prints in its July issue some Revolutionary correspondence of Colonel Josiah Parker of

Isle of Wight County, Virginia. Included in the correspondence is a letter from Thomas Jefferson, October 26, 1780, one from Major-General Steuben, January 13, 1781, two from Thomas Nelson, June 8 and July 27, 1781, and two from Lafayette, July 18 and 27, 1781. In a selection of letters from the society's collection appear the following: a letter (April 29, 1689) from Nicholas Spencer, secretary of state of Virginia, 1679–1689, to the Lords of the Privy Council, an account of the attack on Rhode Island in 1778, communicated by John Banister to the Virginia delegates in Congress, and several other letters of the Revolutionary period and after. A list of references to colleges and schools found in Richmond newspapers, 1786–1820, given in this issue of the *Magazine*, is indicative of the extent of material of this sort pertaining to the history of education in Virginia.

The July number of the *William and Mary College Quarterly Magazine* contains a brief discussion of the Whig Party in the South, suggested by Dr. A. C. Cole's book of that title which recently appeared. Other contents, aside from genealogical materials, are continuations of the documentary series, notes from the records of York County, records of Hanover County, and extracts from the diary of Edmund Ruffin. The period covered by the diary is from June, 1864, to June, 1865.

The March–October issue of the *German American Annals* consists of a narrative of Christoph von Graffenried, in French, found by Professor Albert B. Faust in Bern, and presented by him as a better version of Graffenried's story of the founding of Newbern and of his American adventures than either of the two versions which have already been made known, the first (French) by the English translation in the *Colonial Records of North Carolina*, volume I., and the second (German) in a previous volume of the *Annals*.

In connection with his eleventh and twelfth annual reports as director, a notable record of two years' progress, Dr. Dunbar Rowland presents in some ninety pages, with an index, *An Official Guide to the Historical Materials in the Mississippi Department of Archives and History*, in which, in a systematic arrangement, every portion of the remarkable collection of documents he has collected during the ten years of his service is listed in proportionate detail. Such systematic surveys of archives are as welcome as they are rare.

Decisive Episodes in Western History, an address delivered before the Iowa State Historical Society in February by Laenas G. Weld, has been published by the society.

The issue of the *Quarterly Publication of the Historical and Philosophical Society of Ohio* for January and April (double number) is devoted entirely to a series of Burr-Blennerhassett documents. There are twenty-one documents in all, principally depositions and affidavits, the first ten of which are presumed to form a part of the original testi-

mony prepared for the Burr trial at Richmond and transmitted to Ohio for use in the Blennerhassett trial, the remaining eleven being drawn from the papers of John Stites Gano presented to the society by Mrs. Laura Vallette Gano. The documents are well edited by Leslie Henshaw, assistant in history in the University of Cincinnati.

The contents of the July number of the *Ohio Archæological and Historical Quarterly* include some extracts from the *American State Papers*, presented by A. J. Morrison, concerning a grant by the Continental Congress of a township in Ohio to Arnold H. Dohrman, sometime agent for the United States at the court of Lisbon; the Ohio Prospectus for the Year 1775, by the same writer; a sketch of Clement L. Vallandigham, by W. H. Van Fossan; the Beginnings of Lutheranism in Ohio, by B. F. Prince; and a sketch of Simon Perkins, brigadier-general in the War of 1812, by W. W. Spooner.

The Department of Indiana History and Archives has been indexing for historical purposes a number of the oldest newspapers in the state, giving special attention to its file of the Vincennes *Sun*, which begins in 1807.

The articles of chief interest in the June number of the *Indiana Magazine of History* are: Home Life in Early Indiana, by W. F. Vogel; the Campaign of 1888 in Indiana, by R. C. Buley; and Conscription and Draft in Indiana during the Civil War, by C. E. Canup.

The publication committee of the Illinois Centennial Commission has made arrangements to publish, on occasion of the state's celebration in 1918, a history of Illinois in five volumes, of which Professor Clarence W. Alvord is to be editor-in-chief.

Four volumes of the *Illinois Historical Collections* belonging to the British series and illustrating fully the period of Illinois history from 1763 to 1776, edited by Professors Clarence W. Alvord and Clarence E. Carter, are now in the press. It is expected that two volumes will be ready for distribution in January. Other publications in progress are: a series of volumes containing sources for the early exploration of the Illinois country, edited by Dr. Frank E. Melvin; a volume of political statistics prepared by Dr. Solon J. Buck and Dr. Wayne E. Stevens; several volumes, edited by Professors J. A. James and Charles H. Ambler, made up from the newly found George Rogers Clark material in the Virginia State Library; and a collection of the letters and speeches of Lincoln previous to his inauguration, edited by Professors Daniel K. Dodge and Clarence W. Alvord, who request the co-operation of persons possessing information in regard to unpublished Lincoln material.

The *Annual Report* of the Chicago Historical Society for the year 1913, just issued, includes biographical sketches of deceased members, an account of the society's activities, and lists of accessions of manuscripts

and books. Among the manuscripts acquired are some letter-books and correspondence of William B. Ogden, 1836–1850, a letter-book of Richard J. Hamilton, 1842–1849, minutes of the Chicago Medical Society, etc.

Recent accessions to the Burton Historical Library, Detroit, include the papers of Thomas W. Palmer, formerly United States senator from Michigan.

The State Historical Society of Wisconsin has published as a memorial to its late superintendent, Dr. Reuben G. Thwaites, a small volume containing a memorial address upon his life and work by Professor Frederick J. Turner, and a bibliography of Dr. Thwaites's writings. It has also issued a new volume of *Proceedings* for 1913 containing a paper on the Spanish Domination of Upper Louisiana, by Judge Walter B. Douglas; one on the Telegraph in Wisconsin, by Ellis B. Usher; one on La Vérendrye's Farthest West, by Doane Robinson; and the Recollections of Antoine Grignon. The society has in press a volume beginning the calendaring of the Draper Collection of manuscripts.

Wisconsin, its Story and Biography, in eight volumes, by E. B. Usher, is put forth by the Lewis Publishing Company.

The *Register* of the Kentucky State Historical Society for September contains a paper on the late Vice-President Stevenson, an account of MacArthur's raid of 1814, by A. C. Quisenberry, a paper on some early engineers and architects in Kentucky, by Alfred Pirtle, and extracts from certain county records.

The History of Unity Baptist Church, Muhlenberg County, Kentucky, by Otto A. Rothert (Louisville, Press of John P. Morton and Company, 1914, pp. 59), is a modest and very intelligent account of a single church, in which, with many interesting extracts from the record books of the church, the author enables one to understand the meaning and influence of such an organization.

In the July number of the *Iowa Journal of History and Politics* are two valuable studies by Jacob Van der Zee, French Discovery and Exploration of the Eastern Iowa Country before 1763, and Fur Trade Operations in the Eastern Iowa Country under the Spanish Régime. Other articles in this number of the *Journal* are on the Private Land Claims of the Northwest Territory, by Louis Pelzer, and on the Quakers of Iowa in 1858, by Sarah Lindsey.

In the April number of the *Annals of Iowa* is a tribute to William B. Allison by Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, revised and adapted from his memorial address delivered in the United States Senate in February, 1909. Frank M. Mills writes of Early Commercial Travelling in Iowa, and John F. Lacey some Recollections of 1864.

The manuscript division of the Missouri Historical Society has acquired a group of autographs and letters of the Missouri Confederate Generals A. E. Steen, F. M. Cockrell, D. M. Frost, John S. Bowen, M. Jeff Thompson, and Sterling Price (this last mentioned letter, also signed by Ex-Governor Trusten Polk, was addressed to Governor Reynolds and relates to the Missouri general election of August, 1864); a very interesting letter of George Croghan, dated December 21, 1768; and a book of field notes of the west boundary of Missouri, south of the mouth of the Kansas River, made in 1823 by Joseph C. Brown. The library has received an unusual collection of pamphlets relating to the Icarian Colony at St. Louis, and the archaeological department a fine collection of pipes, gathered in every part of the world and comprising several hundred specimens, and a collection of Indian relics, numbering several thousand and representing the entire range of surface finds.

Volume III. of the *Official Report of the Debates and Proceedings in the Nebraska Constitutional Convention assembled in Lincoln, June 13, 1871*, revised and edited by Albert Watkins, has been issued as vol. VIII. (series II.) of the *Publications* of the Nebraska State Historical Society. The volume (676 pages) contains also the journals of the convention of 1875, a history of the attempt to form a state organization in 1860, of the abortive constitutional convention of 1864, of the formation and adoption of the constitution of 1866, and of the origin of the conventions of 1871 and 1875.

The July number of the *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* contains the opening chapters of an extended study, by R. G. Cleland, of the Early Sentiment for the Annexation of California; an Account of the Growth of American Interest in California, 1835–1846; the first half of a careful study, by Anna I. Sandbo, of the Beginnings of the Secession Movement in Texas; and an interesting paper by Miss Elizabeth H. West on Southern Opposition to the Annexation of Texas, casting new light upon the subject.

Vol. IV. of the *Collections* of the State Historical Society of North Dakota is just appearing from the press. Among the papers two documents are of special interest to the history of the lower Red River Valley: a reprint of Judge Coltman's summary of evidence in the famous controversy between the Northwest Company and the Hudson's Bay Company, 1816–1821, and the minutes of council of the latter company, 1833–1841, placed at the disposal of the historical society by their owner, a famous employee of the company. Among the more noteworthy local studies are one on the Hudson's Bay Company and the Red River Fur Trade, and one on the Establishment of our Northern International Boundary Line. There is an excellent history of the Presbyterian church in North Dakota, which furnishes some typical sketches of frontier missionary life, while the history of one of the western counties affords an interesting glimpse of the conflict between ranchers and farmers

in the early days of Dakota Territory. The volume contains also lists of early residents in the census for certain counties in 1885.

Miss Katharine B. Judson's *Subject-Index to the History of the Pacific Northwest and of Alaska* (Olympia, Washington State Library, pp. 341) is an index to official publications of the federal government, from 1789 to 1817. For Alaska, we are to have before long an extraordinarily complete bibliography, prepared at the instance of Judge Wickersham by the competent hands of Mr. Hugh A. Morrison of the Library of Congress.

Mr. C. O. Ermatinger contributes to the July number of the *Washington Historical Quarterly* a paper concerning the Columbia River under the Hudson's Bay Company, and Professor Edmond S. Meany a discourse upon Three Diplomats prominent in the Oregon Question. The three diplomats were John Quincy Adams, Henry Clay, and Albert Gallatin. Professor Meany's paper is the presidential address before the Pacific Coast Branch of the American Historical Association in May. The Journal of John Work (September 7 to December 14, 1825), edited by T. C. Elliott, is continued, as is also the new Vancouver journal begun in the April number of the *Quarterly*, and edited by Professor Meany.

The issue of the *Quarterly of the Oregon Historical Society* for December contains the reminiscences of Captain William P. Gray, a resident of Oregon since his birth in 1845, some letters of Burr Osborn giving his reminiscences of the Howison expedition to Oregon in 1846, and the journal of Alexander Ross on the Snake Country Expedition in 1824. For the last mentioned document Mr. T. C. Elliott contributes editorial notes. The other two referred to are contributed by Fred Lockley and George H. Himes, respectively.

The Dominion Archives have in press a *Guide to the Documents in the Manuscript Room at the Public Archives of Canada*, prepared by Mr. David W. Parker.

The Champlain Society has just brought out the first volume of its new edition of Captain John Knox's *Historical Journal of the Campaigns in North America, 1757–1760*, edited by the Dominion Archivist, Dr. Arthur G. Doughty. Among the books which the society has in preparation are a series of three volumes upon the War of 1812, by Lt.-Col. William Wood, containing much material hitherto unpublished; a volume relating to the administration of General Murray, to be edited by Mr. Duncan A. McArthur; a volume relating to the administration of Sir Charles Bagot, to be edited by Professor Kylie of Toronto; and a volume on the Clergy Reserves, by Mr. J. P. Lacock.

Volume I. of Mr. Gustavus Myers's *History of Canadian Wealth* (Chicago, Kerr), a companion study to that author's *Great American Fortunes*, deals with the causes of the concentration of wealth in Canada: the fur-trade, the concentration of railroads, and the influence of land and money subsidies granted by the government.

Martinus Nijhoff of the Hague has begun the issue of an *Encyclopaedie van Nederlandsch West-Indië*, edited by Dr. H. D. Benjamins and Joh. F. Snelleman. The work, which is of a high order, is announced to be completed (in 1915 it was hoped) in from ten to fifteen parts, of which the first has already appeared.

Messrs. Scribner's South American series has been increased by the addition of *Ecuador: its Ancient and Modern History, Topography, and Natural Resources, Industries, and Social Development*, by C. Reginald Enock.

C. A. Villanueva has published an *Historia de la República Argentina* (Paris, Rosas, 1914, pp. 871), and Professor D. Antakoletz has begun the publication of an *Histoire de la Diplomatie Argentine* of which the first volume (Paris, Pedone, 1914) treats the years 1810–1814.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: R. T. McKenzie, *A New View of Benjamin Franklin* (Century Magazine, July); O. Beuve, *Un Petit-Fils de Montesquieu, Soldat de l'Indépendance Américaine, d'après des Documents inédits* (Revue Historique de la Révolution Française et de l'Empire, April); M. Serrano y Sanz, *El Brigadier Jaime Wilkinson y sus Tratos con España para la Independencia del Kentucky, Años 1787 a 1797*, I. (Revista de Archivos, Bibliotecas, y Museos, March); Elihu Root, *The Monroe Doctrine* (North American Review, June); T. S. Woolsey, *The Monroe Doctrine* (*ibid.*); Hiram Bingham, *Latin America and the Monroe Doctrine* (Yale Review, July); W. K. Boyd, *The Finances of the North Carolina Literary Fund*, I. (South Atlantic Quarterly, July); C. F. Adams, *Civil War Literature* [Lord Newton's *Lord Lyons*] (Nation, July 16, 23, 30, August 6); W. L. Hall, *Lincoln's Interview with John B. Baldwin* (South Atlantic Quarterly, July); A. S. Tuaner, *La Révolution de Panama, 3 Novembre 1903* (Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique, XXVIII. 2); G. Wegener, *Der Panamakanal: seine Geschichte, seine Technische Herstellung, seine künftige Bedeutung* (Volkswirtschaftliche Zeitfragen, XXXVI. 2).